

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GENERAL SCOWCROFT ON CHINESE SATELLITE LAUNCHES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Brent Scowcroft, the former National Security Advisor, and Mr. Arnold Kanter, the former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, wrote an excellent article in the Washington Times on June 5, 1998 on the topic of Chinese satellite launches: "What Technology Went Where and Why."

Their article treats this issue fairly and dispassionately, and goes a long way toward dispelling much of the misinformation in current public discussion.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Washington Times, June 5, 1998]

WHAT TECHNOLOGY WENT WHERE AND WHY

(By Brent Scowcroft and Arnold Kanter)

The last few weeks have seen an avalanche of melodramatic charges about American "technology transfers" to China and claims that these actions have enhanced the capabilities of nuclear missiles aimed at the United States. In combination with confusing—and confused—media reporting and inept responses by the Clinton administration, these accusations threaten both to do needless damage to important U.S. national security interests and to impede the investigation of serious allegations of wrongdoing.

A great deal hangs in the balance. The consequences, if these allegations are proven, would be substantial. But the costs of accusations which turn out to be ill-founded—if not reckless—also can be great. Nowhere is this more clear than in the case of our relations with China. Not only is the character of our strategic relationship with China of fundamental importance to U.S. national security, but that relationship also is at an unusually critical and formative state both bilaterally and with respect to larger issues ranging from North Korea to South Asia.

The investigative congressional committees that are being established will have the responsibility for sorting out this complicated affair. Meanwhile, however, the protagonists in this controversy need to cool the rhetoric, get some basic facts straight and identify the real issues before more harm is done to U.S. security, political and economic interests.

Much of the confusion arises from the fact that four different issues are being lumped together:

U.S. government waivers to permit American commercial satellites to be launched on Chinese space boosters.

The unauthorized transfer to China of technical information by two U.S. satellite manufacturers, Loral and Hughes.

Large campaign contributions to the Democratic Party by Loral's chairman, Bernard Schwartz.

Alleged contributions to the Democratic Party by Chinese citizens with ties both to the Chinese military and the Chinese com-

pany that launches American commercial satellites.

SATELLITE WAIVERS.

The current controversy has its roots in the 1986 Challenger disaster. There was serious concern that the loss of U.S. launch capability that resulted from the ensuing moratorium on shuttle flights would jeopardize America's pre-eminence in space. The Reagan administration responded by adopting a policy that opened the way for U.S. commercial satellites to be launched on Chinese space boosters on a case-by-case basis. The sanctions imposed by the Bush administration following the Tiananmen Square massacre in June 1989 blocked satellite launches by the Chinese but included a provision for case-by-case presidential waivers.

Last February, the State and Defense Departments recommended, and President Clinton approved, such a waiver to allow a commercial communications satellite built by Loral to be launched into orbit by a Chinese booster. This was the eighth waiver—covering eleven launches—approved by the Clinton administration. Previously, the Bush administration approved three waivers covering the launch of nine satellites.

The satellites in question are civilian, not military. More important, no "technology transfer" is permitted in connection with these satellite launches, which are the space-age equivalent of having Federal Express deliver a package across the country. On the contrary, there are strict safeguards designed to confine Chinese access to the most basic information about the U.S. payload these rockets carry—for example, size, weight and other mating data needed to ensure that the satellite will fit on top of the rocket and can be boosted into the correct orbit. (The waivers in question relate to the application of Tiananmen sanctions—which are designed to punish the Chinese for human rights abuses—not the safeguards against technology transfer.)

In principle, these safeguards mean that the Chinese learn no more about the "package" they are launching than FedEx knows about the package it is shipping, and that no information is provided which would improve the capabilities of their civilian space boosters, much less their nuclear-armed missiles. The March 1996 transfer of responsibility for licensing commercial satellite exports from the State Department to the Commerce Department likewise should not have had any effect on the strictness or application of the safeguards because a separate State Department license typically is still required to permit the Chinese to launch U.S. satellites, and the Defense Department continues to review all proposed waivers to ensure they are in the national security interest of the U.S.

ASSISTANCE TO THE CHINESE ROCKET PROGRAM.

The Justice Department is investigating the unauthorized transfer of information to China by Loral and Hughes in connection with a 1996 review of the explosion of a Long March rocket launching a U.S. satellite. Because of the virtual identity between these Chinese "space boosters" and military missiles, assistance to the former could lead to improvements in the latter.

Experts from Loral, Hughes and other companies became involved in this review at the insistence of the international insurance in-

dustry, which refused to insure more Long March launches until an "outside" team reviewed the Chinese analysis of, and remedies for, the malfunctions their rockets had been experiencing. Ironically, the Chinese initially resisted this proposal, and allowed the international team of experts to conduct their review only when they became convinced that these insurance problems would jeopardize their commercial space launch business.

According to news reports, a Pentagon agency has determined that the information which Loral and Hughes transferred to the Chinese caused "harm" to U.S. national security, but the nature and extent of whatever harm was done is not yet clear. The congressional investigating committees will try to get the answers to that question. What does seem clear at this point is that the Chinese government never requested information or other assistance from our government to improve the space boosters they use to launch satellites. What is even more clear is that in 1996 the U.S. government did not provide, or approve Loral and Hughes providing, information which would improve Chinese space launch or missile capabilities.

Indeed, Loral and Hughes are under investigation for unauthorized transfer of information. The Justice Department's reservations about the February 1998 satellite waiver stemmed not from the waiver itself, but from a concern about how it might affect a jury's psychology should Justice decide to prosecute these two satellite manufacturers for what they may have done in connection with their review of the 1996 Long March rocket failure.

LORAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

According to news reports, Mr. Schwartz—Loral's chairman and CEO—is the largest single contributor to the Democratic Party. Loral also was the beneficiary of the waiver which President Clinton approved in February. In addition, Loral successfully sought (along with other U.S. satellite manufacturers), presidential approval for the transfer of authority over the licensing process from the State Department to the Commerce Department. Many have suggested a relationship between the Schwartz campaign contributions and these Clinton decisions.

The question not only is legitimate, but goes to the heart of the larger issue of the impact of campaign fundraising and contributions on the American political process. But even if suspicions prove correct, the fact remains that no "technology transfer" is authorized when Loral (or any other American) satellites are launched by Chinese rockets. Moreover, there is no current indication that any of the laws, policies and other safeguards against such technology transfers were relaxed as a result of campaign contributions. The issue of whether campaign contributions influenced presidential decisions in this case is of profound seriousness and should be pursued by the congressional investigative committees, but appears at this point to be essentially unrelated to the issue of technology transfer to China.

CHINESE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

Democratic fundraiser Johnny Chung reportedly has told investigators that he served as a conduit for political contributions from the Chinese government. Specifically, he claims that Liu Chaoying, who is

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

an officer in the Chinese army and an executive in the Chinese company which (among its many business enterprises) launches satellites, gave him money with instructions to donate a portion of those funds to the Democratic Party.

If substantiated, these assertions could have serious implications. That said, it also should be noted that, provided the safeguards described above do their job, even if a quid pro quo were sought and given, a satellite waiver might work to the commercial advantage of Liu's company, but would not have contributed to China's military capabilities.

In sum, several of the issues being raised in the current controversy are real and serious. Others, particularly those related to charges that satellite launch waivers somehow enhanced Chinese missile capabilities, may be based on fundamentally mistaken premises. Key to making that determination is an assessment of the practical effectiveness of the safeguards policies and practices that apply to these satellite launches.

If careful analysis determines that these safeguards have substantially achieved their objectives, then the imposition of blanket prohibitions on satellite launches by China would largely miss the point. On the one hand, it would not deal with concerns about how campaign contributions—from Americans, to say nothing of Chinese—might influence government decisions in ways which produce commercial advantage. On the other hand, it could prove to be worse than redundant with the safeguards already in place, because it would both place American industry at a competitive disadvantage and do needless damage to our critically important relationship with China.

One fact, however, already is abundantly clear: A great deal is at stake in the answers to the questions being raised in the current controversy. It therefore is essential that we get it right—that all of the charges be thoroughly investigated, that penalties be levied where appropriate, and that remedial actions be taken where required. But we should let the congressional committees do their jobs before a rush to judgment that may harm rather than advance our interests.

HOW TO BUILD A BETTER SCHOOL SYSTEM

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from The Washington Times illustrates why we should help parents send their children to schools of their choice. Mayor Stephen Goldsmith of Indianapolis uses the situation in that city to demonstrate why Catholic schools have been able to perform better than the public schools. I submit the editorial to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HOW TO BUILD A BETTER SCHOOL SYSTEM (By Stephen Goldsmith)

President Clinton found ardent supporters of his proposal to invest in public school buildings at a recent meeting with members of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. More money for schools—without having to raise local taxes—is a no-brainer for many mayors seeking an answer to failing urban schools.

Yet there are a handful of mayors from both parties who believe that more than federal dollars are needed to address the real problems facing urban schools. As cities have

experienced the downward spiral of rising taxes, declining enrollment and abysmal students performance, increasingly city leaders are recognizing that lack of money is not what ails our public school systems.

The Indianapolis Public School system is the largest of eleven in this city, responsible for approximately 43,000 students from the central part of the city. During the 1990s the district raised its taxes more than a third, even as enrollment dropped by 10 percent. Not including teacher pensions, IPS spends more than \$9,000 per child—as much if not more than the city's most expensive private schools. If money were the key ingredient for quality schools, students at IPS would rank among the best in the world. Instead, student test scores are among the worst in Indiana—a state that consistently ranks in the bottom 10 percent in the nation.

As the district's declining enrollment makes clear, dissatisfied parents are seeking out alternatives to public schools. While middle and upper class families often either move to the suburbs or pay private school tuition, many less affluent parents have turned to a less expensive choice: Catholic schools.

Like IPS, inner city parochial schools in Indianapolis are racially diverse and serve primarily low income, non-Catholic kids. At St. Philip Neri, a Catholic school on the city's near east side, nearly three quarters of all students qualify for the federal school lunch program, and a similar proportion are not Catholic.

Unlike IPS, tuition at these schools averages a mere \$2700 per child. Yet each year parochial students demonstrate a better grasp of learning fundamentals than students in the public school system. Perhaps even more telling, student performance improves for each year spend in Catholic schools, while scores at IPS decline. In a recent evaluation of standardized test scores, Catholic school third graders held relatively small advantages over IPS students in math and English. By the eighth grade, however, Catholic school students scored nearly twice as high as students in the public system.

There are two important reasons why Catholic schools outperform their public counterparts.

First, they are allowed to succeed. Catholic schools are free from the bloated education bureaucracies that divert tax dollars away from public classrooms. The Friedman Foundation estimates that as little as 30 cents out of every dollar spent on education in Indianapolis actually make their way to the places where children learn. The rest is lost on the layers of bureaucracy between Indiana's Department of Education and teachers. For example, over the next three years the IPS Service Center, which houses support services such as vehicle maintenance, media services, and a print shop, will undertake a nearly \$7.5 million capital improvement project. The task: constructing a new kitchen.

In addition to siphoning off dollars, the school bureaucracy undermines public education by dictating in great detail how principals can run their schools and teachers can teach their students. The morass of regulations governing public education prevents teachers from tailoring their teaching to the diverse needs of students and taking innovative approaches to educating. Not coincidentally, some of the best IPS schools are those at which teachers routinely disregard many of these rules, using their own choice of textbooks, curricula, and teaching methods to ensure that kids learn.

The other reason that Catholic schools succeed is equally simple: they have to. If St. Philip Neri fails to satisfy its customers, parents will take their tuition dollars else-

where. In contrast, customer satisfaction is irrelevant to public schools, especially those serving low income families. Government simply tells these parents which school their children must attend, and parents who cannot afford a private alternative have no choice but to send their children there, regardless of how poorly that school performs.

If we are committed to giving all our children an opportunity, we must apply to the public school system the same simple principles that enable private and parochial schools to succeed.

In Indianapolis, our experience with allowing public employees and private companies to compete for contracts to provide city services has consistently demonstrated that competition improves government-run enterprises. For each of the 75 services subjected to competition, marketplace pressure has exploded bureaucracies, reducing layers of management, empowering workers, and refocusing these agencies on satisfying their customers. In order to win business, public employees have cut their own budgets while improving service quality, dramatically outperforming their previous, better-funded monopoly.

The same competitive forces can empower public schools to succeed. Committed reformers have offered numerous proposals to break up the government school monopoly and empower public schools to educate more effectively, including vouchers, charter schools, and the education savings accounts currently before Congress. Unfortunately, the president's threatened veto of the education savings proposal demonstrates that this administration continues to believe that any problem can be cured with more federal dollars.

Forcing lower income parents to send their children to poorly performing schools (even in nice buildings) will not improve the prospects of urban youths. What our cities' mayors should be advocating for in Washington is not simply more money to support a failing school bureaucracy, but more help for parents to send their children to the schools of their choice.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2400, BUILDING EFFICIENT SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND EQUITY ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 22 1998

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science whose jurisdictional area of expertise includes transportation research and development once again is pleased to have worked closely with the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in efforts to strengthen the research program of the Department of Transportation by first developing a comprehensive research title for the House version of this legislation and later by serving as conferees on the research title.

I would like to thank Chairmen SHUSTER and PETRI as well as Ranking Democratic Members OBERSTAR and RAHALL for their cooperation in bringing a research title to the floor which incorporated most of the significant provisions reported by the Committee on Science and for working with us to ensure that the House comprehensive research program prevailed in conference to the extent possible. I

believe our cooperative efforts in 1992 contributed significantly to the strengthening of Department of Transportation surface transportation research in the ensuing years; I am equally convinced that our efforts during 1997 and 1998 will take these research programs to a higher level. While I am deeply disappointed with how a handful of provisions turned out, overall I feel this legislation is an improvement over existing law.

Unfortunately, the Statement of Managers for the bill before us omitted the explanation of all of the research title except for the Intelligent Transportation System. While many of these provisions are clear on their face, I feel in other instances, an explanation of Congressional intent should be included in the legislative history. Therefore, at this point, I would like to discuss a number of these provisions for which the Science Committee leadership served as conferees and where Science Committee members had concerns.

Section 5108, entitled Surface Transportation Research Strategic Planning, makes it clear that the Secretary is to oversee an integrated planning process in consultation with all other Federal agencies involved in surface transportation research, State and Local governments, and private sector organizations involved in surface transportation research to make sure that the Department's efforts have a strategic focus, clear goals, and measurable results. This section builds on the work the Department has begun under the guidance of the Deputy Secretary. The language retains other important features from our Committee's work product including tie-ins to the Government Performance and Results Act, outside review of Department plans, emphasis on merit review, and tying in the plans, research and results of each Departmental research program to this planning effort.

Section 5102, Surface Transportation Research, ended up containing programs which originated in Committee-passed sections dealing with research, technology development, and technology transfer. Among the items of importance to the Committee on Science are the new 23 USC 502(c)(2) and (f) which provide for research, development, and technology transfer related to surface transportation infrastructure such as enhancing emphasis on seismic research and on demonstrating innovative recycled materials, especially the use of paper and plastics to replace metal mesh in reinforced highway concrete. The Committee also placed strong emphasis on increasing the knowledge base necessary for state and local governments to do contracting based on life cycle cost analysis including the development of standardized estimates for the useful life of advanced highway and infrastructure materials. The Committee is well aware that if the useful life of the average highway could be extended by just one year, that the entire surface transportation research program of the Federal government could be paid for many times over and is interested in stopping the phenomenon of the products of advanced research sitting on the shelf because local contracting officers are either unfamiliar with them or do not know how to evaluate their usefulness.

Section 5104, Training and Education, continues a variety of training and scholarship programs of the Department. The Committee through language now included at 23 USC 504(b)(2)(A)(i) had interest in strengthening

undergraduate training and technical assistance to local transportation agencies through programs such as the Middle Tennessee Graduate 2000 program which was designed in conjunction with the concrete industry and state officials to assure an adequate supply of bachelor level professionals who are knowledgeable about the concrete industry and capable of making decisions related to the adoption of new technologies. We feel this is a necessary complement to our changes in Section 5102. Even if we are successful in getting the Department to fund research on life cycle costing and to develop standardized estimates of useful lives for new technologies, these are unlikely to be utilized in the absence of a technologically educated workforce.

Section 5107, the Surface Transportation-Environment Cooperative Research Program, is an idea promoted both by the Senate and by the Committee on Science. Its goal is to promote an increased awareness of the environmental and social impacts of transportation decisions through research to better understand factors related to transportation demand, by developing indicators of economic, social, and environmental performance of transportation systems, and by establishing an Advisory Board to recommend environmental and energy conservation research, technology and technology transfer activities related to surface transportation.

Section 5110, is one section with a disappointing final form. While we appreciate the Conference Committee's retention of our emphasis on merit selection of University Transportation Research Centers, we feel it is a mistake to list 21 recipients of earmarks and to mandate those earmarks in specific amounts for six years. This defeats both the principle of awarding contracts to the most qualified institutions and of continuing funding only for those institutions which perform satisfactorily under the grants. The House version of this legislation listed a number of other locations which Members of Congress considered to have meritorious programs and required the Secretary to consider applications for these institutions while not requiring actual rewards. For instance, under the House provision, which we considered to be preferable, the Secretary would have considered applications from schools like Middle Tennessee State University, Tennessee Technological University, and the University of Maryland which our membership considers to have sophisticated transportation programs, but the Secretary would only have awarded and renewed grants to these institutions if the applications from the school was meritorious and its performance under existing grants was satisfactory.

We are in agreement with the Statement of Managers language on the Intelligent Transportation System Subtitle and were pleased to be able to make a contribution to it. Our Committee's main emphases were expedited standards development for the intelligent transportation systems (ITS) program to decrease the chance of deployment of incompatible systems, increased data collection and information sharing responsibilities for recipients of grants for ITS operational tests or deployment, making sure that adequate attention is paid to the basic and human factors research related to ITS, and making sure that the special needs of ITS in cold climates were addressed.

I would like to close by commenting on the bill's removal of the deadline for conversion of highway construction to the metric system of measurement and its deferring to the states in this matter. This modification does not change the basic underlying facts that metric is still by law the preferred system of measurement in the United States, that U.S. government procurement and business related activities are to be conducted in metric, and that the rest of the world is moving to metric at a very rapid clip. Metric is the official system of measurement throughout Asia; all regulations in the European Union are being written in metric. Metric measurement is the standard throughout the Americas including Mexico and Canada. Metric measurement is rapidly becoming predominant in U.S. highway construction. Fortunately, this provision is not expected to bring much change. A quick survey of the states has shown that 90 percent of them do not plan to exercise this option and revert to the English system of measurement.

HONORING LORI PARCEL

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Ms. Lori Parcel of Greenwood, Indiana in my District is the winner of the 1998 Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest for Indiana. I am pleased to present her winning script for the RECORD.

Who hasn't solved a jigsaw puzzle? We all have been faced with the task of one time or another. I remember the last time I tried to solve one. After hours of work, the puzzle was nearly complete . . . and then I realized that some of the pieces were missing. I scoured the area in search of the missing pieces, but I was unable to find them. The puzzle remained incomplete. In many ways, our democracy is a puzzle that consists of over 250 million pieces. Over 250 million voices which are inextricably bound. And interlocked within this tapestry, the tapestry of democracy, is my voice.

I realize that all of the pieces of the puzzle must be present for our government to be fully effective. However, looking around, I can't help but notice gaps in democracy's tapestry. Gaps which surely weaken the entire structure. I raise my voice to cry out to the missing pieces, to tell them to join the majority of Americans, to exchange ideas and strengthen our government, but my cry does not reach some. They do not understand that by discounting their own voices, and by ignoring my plea, they are hurting both themselves and our government. They do not realize that a democracy such as ours cannot effectively operate without their input. I use my voice to tell them about the time I was paging in the state legislature. I tell of a man who came into the statehouse and observed me tallying opinion surveys. The man, presumably a stray piece, was surprised that the surveys were tallied. He expressed his astonishment by saying, "That's where those surveys go. You actually read these. I did not think anyone listened, or that it was worth spending money for a stamp." The man did not understand that the absence a single voice, a solitary note in the symphony of our government, can throw harmony into discord.

I plea to the stray pieces once again. I tell them that, during my experience paging, I

learned that legislators are people. They have pictures of their families on their desks, and they even drink coffee. They are no different from the rest of us except they have decided to make a career out of using their voices to build our democracy, to add more pieces to the puzzle in hope of solving our nation's problems.

But certainly one does not have to hold public office to have a voice in our government. Rosa Parks provided the impetus for the Civil Rights movement by simply refusing to give up her seat on the bus. She did not even have to open her mouth to have her voice heard throughout the nation.

My voice will not be the missing piece of the puzzle or the chord absent in the symphony. I may speak loudly and run for public office. Or I may speak softly by writing to my representative to tell him my opinions on an issue. But regardless of how I speak, my voice will always be audible. It must be, in order for me to be a fully participating member of our democracy. It is my duty to those who have sacrificed and those who continue to work for freedom throughout the world to exercise my right to participate in our government.

I realize that using my voice is critical to the continuation of democracy. Our government consists of millions of voices. Those of politicians and those of voters, but all of which are American voices. Exercising our voices through voting is our privilege, right, and duty as American citizens. In order to truly have a government of, by, and for the people, we must all work to build it. We must all contribute our piece of the puzzle, our voice, to our democracy. When I cast my vote a year from now, I will be doing far more than choosing one candidate from the ballot. I will be contributing my voice to the extensive puzzle which depicts the tapestry of our government. And I will be raising my voice, in harmony, to contribute to that symphony we call democracy.

A TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY BELSKI

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated and devoted friend of Southwest Michigan, Mr. Anthony Belski. This month he is retiring after thirty-six years of service to St. Joseph Public Schools. For twenty-nine of those years, Mr. Belski presided over Lincoln Elementary School as its principal.

During his tenure, Mr. Belski has seen a lot of change but through it all, one thing remains the same—his enduring dedication to the kids. Principals are in a unique position to touch so many lives and to help mold so many futures. As an educator, Mr. Belski is in a unique position to have his hard work live on in each of his students—clearly southwest Michigan is a better place thanks to his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Mr. Anthony Belski for all of his work and wishing him a long, productive, and happy retirement.

TRIBUTE TO FRAN PAVLEY

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Fran Pavley, for her leadership and efforts to improve the quality of life in our community. Fran is a determined, hard working individual who is a shining example of a model citizen, and has been rightly named as the recipient of the Citizen of the Year Award by the Las Virgenes Homeowners Association.

Fran's unwavering dedication to the Agoura Hills community spans back to the incorporation of the city in 1982. Serving as one of the first members of a budding, tightly-knit community, Fran has served continuously on the Agoura Hills City Council since it was created, the same year as the incorporation of the city. In addition, she was elected and served as the City's first mayor. Currently, in her fourth term as mayor, Fran continues to consider legislative, environmental and planning issues as top priorities.

One past achievement that has highlighted a bright career was Fran's authoring the "Transit Needs Study," which led to the creation of such programs as regional Dial-A-Ride and the Beach Bus. Currently, Fran is involved in planning and constructing a community center to serve the citizens of Agoura Hills and Calabasas. In recognition of these and other projects, she recently received the "Distinguished Leadership Award" by the American Planning Association.

In addition to Fran's participation in politics at a local level, she currently serves on the California Coast Commission, which plays a critical part in regulating land-use issues along California's 1100 miles of coastline. In 1996, the council member served as President of the Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities. Currently, she represents eighty-seven cities in the Los Angeles County of Statewide Board of Directors for the League of California Cities. Fran has also served on the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy Advisory Committee, representing Agoura Hills and Westlake.

Growing up in Southern California and completing a Master's Degree in Environmental Planning, Fran has voluntarily offered her personal abilities to enhance and augment our community.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, please join me in paying tribute to Fran Pavley. She has shown an unwavering commitment to the community and deserves our recognition and praise.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CASS BALLENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall vote 208 (the Neumann amendment in the nature of a substitute or the so-called Conservative Action Team "CATs" budget) and rollcall vote 210 (the Republican budget resolution or the Kasich budget) last week, I would have voted in favor of these

measures. On the Spratt substitute, rollcall vote 209, I would have voted "no." I regret that I was unable to be in Washington, D.C., when the House cast these important budget votes.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JAMES L. DANDERAND

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest pleasure that I pay tribute to an exceptionally dedicated and benevolent member of Indiana's First Congressional District, Mr. James L. Danderand, of Dyer, Indiana. After thirty-nine years of continuous service with the institution, Jim retired on March 3, 1998 as Chairman of the Board and President of the Merrillville Branch of Bank One.

Jim graduated from the University of Illinois with a Bachelor of Arts degree. After graduating, he served his country as a Second Lieutenant of Infantry in the United States Army. Beginning his employment with the bank in February of 1959 as a Management Trainee, Jim started his extraordinary rise through his office's employment ranks. Jim was quickly promoted to President on July 18, 1969 and Chairman of the Board on March 14, 1985. Though employed and serving the community through various civic organizations, Jim continued his education through enrollment and completion of American Institute of Banking courses in Chicago, the Harvard Business School's Senior Bank Officers Seminar, Indiana University's Management Course. In addition, he graduated from the University of Wisconsin's Graduate School of Banking.

Jim's remarkable climb up the corporate ladder was accompanied by an ever-increasing group of civic, religious, and philanthropic organizations in which he participated. Jim served in a leadership role as Director of the Lake Area United Way, Director of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Northwest Indiana, Honorary Director of the American Red Cross, Lake County, Indiana Chapter, Director and Chairman of the Northwest Indiana Forum, Director of the Northwest Indiana Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Director of the Hospice of the Calumet Area, Inc., and Director of the Gary Educational Development Foundation, Inc. He also gave his time to the Lay Advisory Board for Catholic Charities, Diocese of Gary, Indiana University Northwest Chancellor's Associate, Purdue University Calumet Chancellor's Associate, Robert Morris and Associates, and the University Club.

While serving the community has always been an extremely important part of Jim's life, there can be no comparison to the dedication Jim has for his family. Jim and his loving wife, Prudy, have four wonderful, grown children, Lisa, Jeff, Jill, and John. Their seven grandchildren are an eternal source of joy and love for Jim and Prudy. Now that he is retired, Jim plans to visit and spend much of his time with his family. Jim's future plans include extensive traveling with his wife, many rounds of golf, and visiting his children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending Jim Danderand for his lifetime of service, success, and dedication to Indiana's First Congressional District. Jim serves as an excellent

example of a true American. His unending service to his country, community, and family has rewarded the people of Indiana's First Congressional District with one of the real heroes of our time.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives and the American public the distinguished contributions of the Naval Research Laboratory on the occasion of its seventy-fifth anniversary.

The Naval Research Laboratory was officially founded in Washington, District of Columbia on July 2, 1923 after Thomas Alva Edison recommended that a modern research facility for the Navy be established. In the following seven decades, research efforts have expanded from the two original areas of scientific endeavor—radio and underwater sound—to nineteen broad areas that encompass many diverse fields.

The Naval Research Laboratory's early research achievements include the discovery and explanation of radio skip distance, the development of the fathometer and early sonar, and the development of the first operational American radar.

During World War II, the Naval Research Laboratory's scientific activities focused on applied research in direct support of combat forces. The Laboratory devised ship electronic countermeasure systems, developed the first application of cryptography in radar identification, and invented the first Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) radio system in the United States.

After World War II, the Naval Research Laboratory greatly expanded its pre-war research program in radio, radar, underwater sound, chemistry, metallurgy, optics, nuclear science, and cosmic rays.

The naval Research Laboratory pioneered naval research into space launching atmospheric probes with V-2 rockets through the direction of the *Vanguard* project—America's first satellite program. The Laboratory also produced the first satellite communication system by using the moon as a reflector and receiving the returned signals on the Earth's largest parabolic antenna. More recently, the Laboratory developed the Navy's Global Positioning System and built the *Clementine* satellite that conducted the most comprehensive lunar mapping to date. Since the late 1950's, the Naval Research Laboratory's scientists and engineers have designed, built, and launched more than 80 satellites that have expanded our understanding of the vast frontier of space.

The Naval Research Laboratory's facility for the Structure of Matter has become internationally famous for its groundbreaking work in using electron and x-ray diffraction methods for understanding the structure of complicated organic molecules. For his work in this field, the Laboratory's Dr. Jerome Karle received the 1985 Nobel Prize in Chemistry.

The Naval Research Laboratory's current research program spans the scientific spec-

trum—including studies in areas such as advanced materials technology, electronic warfare, infrared countermeasures, fire suppression, information technology, radar technology, monitoring the solar corona and its impact on the Earth's atmosphere, biomolecular engineering, artificial intelligence, remote sensing, meteorology, and oceanography.

Today, the Naval Research Laboratory is well-positioned to enter the 21st century with a strong technical program and all the tools necessary to continue its mission as the United States Navy's corporate laboratory.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the Naval Research Laboratory, and I am certain that the Members of the House will join me in congratulating this distinguished research institution on the celebration of 75 years of scientific achievement.

A TRIBUTE TO SANTA CLARITA, CALIFORNIA'S HERO OF THE WEEK PROGRAM

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to proudly recognize a wonderful program that exists in the city of Santa Clarita called the "Hero of the Week" and those individuals honored under this program.

Started by Maria Fulkerson and Lorraine Grimalde of Santa Clarita Anti-Gang Task Force, the Hero of the Week program focuses on more of the positive actions of our youth rather than the negative that most of the media covers. The program honors students for their positive actions and choices they have demonstrated. The students from the Santa Clarita Valley Junior and Senior High Schools are recommended by teachers and principals based on their observations of the student exhibiting positive behavior.

The students that are selected exhibit the qualities that we are looking for in future leaders of our nation. These students, many of whom have had previous problems of one sort or another, have made remarkable improvements in many different areas. I am proud to honor these students today here on the House floor.

On June 3, 1998, the Hero of the Week program honored 29 members of my community for their outstanding activities that truly made them heroes in our neighborhood. These children have faced serious obstacles and in many cases faltered in the face of adversity. However, none of these students gave up. Their hard work and determination have truly earned them the title "Hero of our Community."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude these remarks by listing the 29 students honored by the city last week. I congratulate them and the city for such a wonderful program helping our students in promoting positive activities.

HERO OF THE WEEK HONOREES

José Acosta—Canyon High School
Gilbert Avalos—Arroyo Seco Jr. High School
Andrew Brown—Canyon High School
Tom Chaney—Sierra Vista Jr. High School
Dionna Curtis—Sierra Vista Jr. High School
Mario de la Torre—Canyon High School
Colleen Dillingham—Saugus High School

Rusmir Dzidic—Hart High School
Jenny Embelton—Placerita Jr. High School
Rigoberto Garcia—Placerita Jr. High School
Kimberly Goff—La Mesa Jr. High School
Chrissy Hambel—Saugus High School
Michael Hardash—La Mesa Jr. High School
Brandi Huff—Canyon High School
Jin Kim—Sierra Vista Jr. High School
Karla Martinez—Bowman High School
Martina Mendez—Hart High School
Eva-Maria Onesto—Saugus High School
Rafael Orellana—Placerita Jr. High School
Ashley Palmer—La Mesa Jr. High School
Angel Rodriguez—Saugus High School
Olivia Sanchez—Bowman High School
Steven Santana—Arroyo Seco Jr. High School
Erik Sayer—Arroyo Seco Jr. High School
Diana Dimone—Valencia High School
Jennifer Sorge—Valencia High School
Joseph Taylor—Saugus High School
Federico Valle—Hart High School
Leopoldo Yepez—Sierra Vista Jr. High School

IN MEMORY OF JUDGE DAVID W. DYER

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of sadness and bereavement that I rise today in order to mark the passing of Judge David W. Dyer.

Judge Dyer began his federal judicial career when he was appointed by President Kennedy to the bench of Florida's Southern District Court in 1961. The following year he was named its Chief Judge. In 1966 he was appointed to the Circuit Court of Appeals, where he served until his retirement in December of 1997.

Community leaders across South Florida are at a loss today because they have lost their leader, mentor, and role model. For many, Judge Dyer is nothing short of a hero. During a time of great national struggle, he consistently advocated and maintained that the Constitution guaranteed equality for all Americans—no matter what their race. To put it simply, he was Florida's most respected jurist.

I would like to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to share with my colleagues two of Judge Dyer's most important achievements. The first was his landmark decision to desegregate the restaurants which serve travelers on Florida's Turnpike. The second was his decision, while sitting on a three judge panel, to reapportion Florida's voting districts on the basis of "one man, one vote." In both instances, he demonstrated his ability to do not only the right thing, but also the just thing.

In April of last year, I had the high honor of introducing H.R. 1479 to this body. Senator BOB GRAHAM introduced companion legislation in the Senate. That legislation, which went on to become Public Law, renamed Miami's Federal Building and Courthouse in honor of Judge Dyer.

Of course, Mr. Speaker I also rise today to mark the passing of a very dear and close friend. I do not think that it is very often in our lives that any of us are able to say that we had the privilege of knowing a 'great man'. But, in this case I think that I am uniquely

blessed. During the time that we spent together, he demonstrated what it meant to defy racial stereotypes.

His loss is not only a personal one, but one to the entire U.S. Judiciary. How long will it be until someone else with his compassion and understanding will grace our presence again? Mr. Speaker and my fellow colleagues, I ask you to join me in hoping that that day will be very, very soon.

SYRACUSE CHILDREN'S CHORUS
REPRESENTS U.S. AT INTER-
NATIONAL FESTIVAL IN CHINA

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in praising the Syracuse Children's Chorus, a group of young singers who will represent not only my home district of Central New York, but in fact, our entire nation when they travel to the International Children's Choir Festival and World Conference in China July 31 through August 14.

The group, directed by Dr. Barbara Marble Tagg, is one of three such groups invited by the government of the Peoples Republic of China, and the only one from the United States.

They will perform in Hong Kong and three mainland cities—Shenzhen, Guilin and Guangzhou. This is a unique honor and a wonderful opportunity. I've known about the Syracuse Children's Chorus since our own children participated and their reputation is outstanding. I know they will represent Central New York and the U.S. very well. I am proud and excited for them and their families.

Since its founding in 1981 by Dr. Tagg, the Syracuse Children's Chorus has become an international model for music education. The SCC has been the recipient of grants from the National Endowment for the Arts and has been heard on National Public Radio. They performed at the 1996 International Society for Music Education World Conference in Amsterdam, following a concert tour of Belgium and Holland that year.

They were also featured at the Walt Disney World Children's Holiday Choral Festival as well as Carnegie Hall in 1991.

The Syracuse Children's Chorus has commissioned more than 50 works for children's choruses by composers from the U.S., Canada and China.

Dr. Tagg is artistic director and founder. She is an Affiliate Artist at Syracuse university where she is a member of the choral music education faculty. She is a remarkable person who has done much for our community.

I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing them well in their performance and their experience.

The Chorus members are: Jessica P. Ashooh, Rachel O. Bass, Elena de la Garza-Bassett, Andrea L. Bess, Erin L. Canavan, Shawna L. Carrigan, Heather N. Charlton, Courtney J. Chiavara, Stacey L. Condolora, Jeffrey B. Corbishley, Elizabeth M. Corcoran, Andrea E. Dunuwila, Brendan E. Dunuwila, Kristen W. El-Hindi, Sarah T. Esagro, Jill R. Evans, Abigail M. Freeman, Rebecca L.

Fullan, Christina Hollenback, Jessica L. Keating, M. Amaris Kinne, Caroline T. Manolakos, Michelle M. Michalenko, Erin M. Molnar, Sidra S. Monreal, Amber L. Moriarty, Marissa H. Mulder, Michelle M. Ostrowski, Kathryn L. Palange, Johanna C. Pingel, Kathryn M. Pratt, Amanda J. Schofield, Katharine J. Suddaby, Elana S. Sukert, Sarah A. Tiedemann, Richard D. Udicious and Carolyn D. Woiler.

The Chorus staff are: Stephen Paparo, conducting intern; Jackie Pickard, chorus manager; Teresa Hudson, chorus administrator; and Michael Wesoloski, director of PR/market-ing. Accompanist is Glenn Kime.

CBO'S FRACTURED CRYSTAL BALL

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, The attached editorial from The Washington Times puts the problems with the Congressional Budget Office in the proper perspective. Stephen Moore's suggested remedies merit serious consideration. I submit the editorial to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO'S FRACTURED CRYSTAL BALL

(By Stephen Moore)

Speaker Newt Gingrich announced last week that Congress should begin to "review the accuracy [sic]" of the economic and budget forecasting of its internal think tank: the Congressional Budget Office. It's about time.

Mr. Gingrich and his GOP colleagues are finally catching on to a problem that many supply side economists have recognized for years. Since at least 1995 the CBO has been dramatically low-balling its economic estimates, and thus overstating the budget deficit. On average CBO has understated GDP growth by 1 percentage point per year—which is a large forecasting error.

One implication of this underestimate of GDP growth has been that the government's official budgeting agency has missed the biggest fiscal story of the last quarter century: a balanced budget with very rapidly rising budget surpluses.

Consider the legacy of error detailed in the attached table. Two years ago, in May 1996 the CBO forecast a 1998 deficit of \$174 billion. Instead, now we are told that we will have a surplus of \$35 billion. This means the CBO's 1996 deficit forecast for 1998 was off by more than \$200 billion. The five year (1998-02) estimated deficit was \$1,167 billion. The latest CBO forecast now sees a surplus over that period of at least \$200 billion. In two years, CBO has revised upward its budget estimate by almost \$1.4 trillion. Incredible.

But the CBO's crystal ball may still be cracked. The latest CBO report that came out in early May 1998 continues to underestimate surpluses. Larry Kudlow of American Skandia and I have estimated that the surplus for this year will be closer to \$70 billion and that future surpluses will be at least twice as high as CBO says.

The CBO has long been bearish on the American economy even as employment, stock values, and business profits soar, inflation approaches zero, and interest rates dip to 20-year lows. The long-term CBO estimate for real GDP growth is a turtle-paced 2.1 percent growth rate for as far as the eye can see. Yet the average GDP growth over the past 16 years has been 3.0 percent. In fairness

to CBO, the Clinton Treasury Department is predicting an equally anemic rate of future growth.

Economic forecasting is at best an inexact science. Some might even call it voo doo. The best—and perhaps the only—semi-reliable forecast of the future is the past. CBO continues to assume that the economy will grow at substantially below its historical trend.

The logical question is: Who cares if CBO is wrong? The answer is that bad forecasts make for bad policies. Republicans in Congress continue to budget as if we are in a deficit environment. In fact, revenues are going to be at least \$500 billion higher from 1998-2002 than they thought last year. This explains why Congress is now pondering a niggardly tax cut of less than \$100 billion when in fact a better economic forecast would demand tax cuts 3-5 times higher than that. Yes, bad numbers lead to bad policies.

Faulty number crunching is also a big problem at CBO's sister agency, the Joint Tax Committee. Last year when the Republican Congress cut the capital gains tax rate from 28 percent to 20 percent the JTC scored this as a five and ten year revenue loser for the government. This ignored all historical evidence to the contrary. For nearly 40 years every capital gains tax cut has yielded more revenues. Every capital gains tax increase, including most notably the 1986 increase, has lowered federal tax receipts. Preliminary tax return data indicate that in the first 10 months since last year's cap gains cut, capital gains receipts are surging. Has JTC learned its lesson? Hardly. The JTC is now scoring a proposal to cut the cap gains tax to a uniform rate of 15 percent. Rather than admitting its error, JTC chooses to stick with its discredited story.

The GOP has no one to blame but itself for these faulty forecasts. The GOP runs Congress nowadays and hence it hires and fires the number-crunchers. But JTC and CBO appear to be using the same Keynesian models the Democrats invented 40 years ago.

It is time for the GOP to launch an assault against the CBO and the JTC. The assault should be based on the fact that CBO's models are broken. The goal is not ideology, but simple accuracy. Newt Gingrich and the Budget Committees should ask these agencies to:

(1) Raise GDP forecasts through 2008 from 2.1 percent to a more realistic 3.0 percent.

(2) Raise revenue growth estimates. CBO (and Treasury) predict 4 percent revenue growth. We've been averaging 7 percent revenue growth since 1982. This year revenues are up an enormous 11 percent. A reasonable revenue growth estimate is 10 percent for 1998 and 7 percent thereafter.

(3) Revise the surplus estimates. Because revenues will be much higher, so will surpluses. With 7 percent revenue growth, the surplus by the year 2002 reaches roughly \$300 billion.

(4) Make dynamic economic estimates of capital gains tax changes. A 15 percent capital gains rate will be extremely bullish for the economy and increase wealth and tax collections.

Most important of all, once armed with these new forecasts, the GOP must abandon its austerity budget strategy and enact a very, very large tax cut. It is time to harness the surpluses in a way that creates more prosperity, not bigger government. American workers and businesses, not politicians, created this prosperity and the expected tide of budget surpluses. Now we deserve a substantial tax cut dividend.

TRIBUTE TO INLAND EMPIRE HIGH SCHOOL VALEDICTORIANS, SALUTATORIANS AND STUDENT SPEAKERS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of an outstanding group of young men and women from my district in Southern California. The 68 students I have listed below have the distinguished honor of being selected as the valedictorians, salutatorians and student speakers of their graduating classes and deserve to be recognized for this laudable achievement.

Representing some of the best and brightest of the Inland Empire's future generation, these students have already accomplished a great deal and stand to reap even more success as the years go by. Education is the most important foundation we can have for life, and these students have realized that potential.

I would especially like to acknowledge those students who have risen above adversity and overcome disadvantages and obstacles that may have threatened to hinder their path to success. I offer my congratulations to each of the graduating seniors and my best wishes for the future. I am very proud to represent such a fine group of young men and women.

Cum Laude Speakers

Alta Loma: Michael Hubbard; Rancho Cucamonga: Cecilia Mo.

Senior Class Speakers

Alta Loma: Kim Anderson; Rancho Cucamonga: Brian Church.

Valedictorians

Etiwanda: Shin' Ning Duh; Ontario: David Lazzara, Daniel Quesada, Mujtaba Saifuddin; Bloomington: Keyla Lee; Fontana: Sambath Oum; A.B. Miller: Doan Nguyen; Eisenhower: Lisa Briones; Rialto: Lee Aleksich, Cristin Manary; Cajon: Shana Baumgartner, Leah Donahue, Khoa Nguyen; San Bernardino: Cristina Rose Brower; San Geronio: Karl Robert Haley, Denney Huynh, Jason Thomas; Pacific: Lien Dang; Chaffey: Tin Diep; Bloomington Christian: Racquel Jefferson; Ambassador Christian: Johnny Stegall; Aquinas: Frank Kreikebaum; New Life Academy: Arlene Romero.

Salutatorians

Etiwanda: Mitesh Popat; Ontario: Heather Davies; Bloomington: Eric Aguirre; Fontana: Thomas Voden, Eric Arthurton; A.B. Miller: Nawal Badran; Eisenhower: Jeannie Huh; Rialto: Sirine Adlouni; Cajon: Alia Little, Andrew England; San Bernardino: Celeste Ruby L. Lim, Sean R. Corley; San Geronio: Minh Ly Luu; Pacific: Chad Milan Timko, Taryn Michelle Harp, Jacqueline Ann Servin; Chaffey: Jung Min Yang, Jessie Stevens; Bloomington Christian: Nicole Miller; Ambassador Christian: Tina Willis, Rochelle Williams; Aquinas: David Colella; New Life Academy: Arlene Romero.

Student Speakers

Valley View: Melissa Ramirez, Hector Morales; Washington: Gilbert Granado, Linda Young; Eric Birch: Carina Higareda; Citrus:

John Felila, Berenice Medina, Gregory Smith, Corey Value; Milor: Angel Venegas, Clarice Lopez, Danielle Patterson; Zupanich: Therese Johnson; Sierra: Jamelle Jones, Azucena Molina, Erik Valadez; San Andreas: Anna Valdez, Mandy McPherson.

LAWRENCE CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL IS CENTRAL STATES WINNER IN WE THE PEOPLE . . . THE CITIZEN AND THE CONSTITUTION NATIONAL FINALS 1998

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Lawrence Central High School of Indianapolis competed in the 1998 National Finals of "We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution" contest in Washington, DC after winning the Indiana competition.

Lawrence Central students competed with more than 1250 students representing 49 states and was the Central States winner. Their teacher was Drew Horvath and the list of students is as follows:

Kari Amos, Robert Baker, Kari Buis, Julie Burton, Sheila Cardinal, Haley Carney, Mark Davis, Justin Gray, Amber Gross, Shawn Haislip, Kristen Halligan, Seth Higgins, Megan Iott, Les Jahnke, Kelly Khoury, Ted Kieffer, Justin Lane, Jolene McClusky, Joyce McCoy, Courtney Mills, Aaron Moberly, Galan Moore, Jon Owens, Chris Recktenwall, Eric Reissner, Kelly Richardson, Lisa Schubert, Tara Sheets, Jennifer Staresnick, and Shane White.

Congratulations to Mr. Horvath, who has sent previous Indiana winners to this competition, and to all of these outstanding students.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. CHARLOTTE WENHAM

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of a great educator, community leader, and good friend to all of Southwest Michigan, Dr. Charlotte Wenham. After thirty years of dedicated service to the students and community of St. Joseph, Michigan, Char is stepping down from her position as Assistant Superintendent of St. Joseph Public Schools.

Since 1968, Dr. Wenham has helped to shape young minds in the St. Joseph Public Schools. First at the head of the class as teacher, then at the head of a school as principal, finally spending the last few years heading an effort to develop innovative and creative programs, curriculum, and policies for the district.

While her talents will be missed, I am happy to report that she will be pursuing other interests in our community and will continue to lend her vast knowledge. While she may be changing roles, her dedication to students, to learning, and to creating a brighter tomorrow won't change.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of my colleagues join me in wishing her many more happy and healthy years. On behalf of southwest Michigan, I would like to thank her for all of her service, dedication and commitment to St. Joseph.

HONORING CAROLE S. POWERS ON HER RETIREMENT FROM TEACHING

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to congratulate my constituent Carole S. Powers on her retirement from the Charles E. Smith Jewish Day School, and from teaching, after more than twenty years of service. Her dedication and commitment to JDS students is not only testimony to her strong commitment to the school and the community, but also to the profession of teaching. Her work has contributed to the high regard in which the Jewish Day School is held by the community.

Over the years, Carole Powers has touched numerous lives and helped shape a multitude of futures. She is one of those teachers to whom former students return years after their graduation to share their successes, and whose influence and impact students remember long after they have left high school. One of those former students reflected on her importance in his education in a letter to the school paper, and I'd like to share just a part of that letter:

"Next week, as I graduate from law school and don the old cap and gown for the last time, I'll have an opportunity to reflect on my 20 years of formal education.

"By my own rough count, I've had well over 100 teachers—from nursery school to JDS, from college to law school. None was as effective as Carole Powers. None came to class every day with as much commitment to her students, and none stretched her student's minds the way she did.

"All of her students were enriched by her career, and we hope to be able to continue to learn from her and draw inspiration from her for many years to come."

Carole Powers has touched numerous lives and helped shape a multitude of futures. I know her colleagues join me in recognizing her many years of service and in wishing her health, happiness and personal fulfillment in her future endeavors.

A SALUTE TO ERWIN J. HEINZELMANN

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize one of the hardest working and effective social reformers in Wisconsin. As friends and colleagues gather to honor Erwin J. Heinzelmänn on the occasion of his retirement from Wisconsin Correctional Service (WCS), after thirty-five years, I would like to take a moment to reflect on his years of service to my home town.

After a stint as a brewery worker, Erv began his public service career as a police aide. Feeling the call to create nonviolent options for offenders, he took a job as a probation officer in Children's Court. During his tenure at Children's Court, Erv correctly observed, before it was commonly acknowledged, that criminal behavior could be generational; that many of his youthful clients came from homes where parents were also involved in the correctional system. Erv joined WCS as a case-worker where he focused on breaking that cycle of violence through the development of innovative rehabilitation programming for offenders.

After just two years on the job, Erv became Executive Director of WCS. He worked tirelessly to secure both private and public resources to fund projects designed to help offenders become responsible citizens. Under his leadership, the staff of WCS grew from five to two hundred and fifty employees. Motivated by his belief that people can change, given professional assistance, Erv and his staff developed an array of creative, justice oriented programming for offenders of all ages, including the first narcotics treatment program in Milwaukee, the oldest correctional halfway house, and even the first private prison in the State of Wisconsin.

Throughout the years, Erv and WCS have received scores of honors and awards, including recognition from the Federal Office of Juvenile Justice, the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Advisory Committee, and the National Institute of Justice. Now Erv is prepared to pass the torch to a new administrator. We can only hope that he will also pass on his well known enthusiasm, as well as his profound commitment to respect for the law, the reparation of harm, and dignity for all.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in extending my appreciation to Erwin J. Heinzelmann for over three decades of service to the people of Wisconsin. Congratulations, Erv, and best wishes for future successes.

**"HATE ON THE INTERNET"—
REMARKS OF JERRY TURK**

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, while the Internet is a wonderful technological tool providing information on a host of subjects and permitting the rapid dissemination of great deal of information on an incredible variety of topics, the Internet is also being used by hate mongers and bigots to peddle their nefarious lies.

A few days ago, my dear friend Mr. Jerry Turk, the President of the Las Vegas Office of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), delivered an excellent speech at the ADL's Distinguished Community Service Award Dinner in Las Vegas. His remarks "Hate on the Internet" are an excellent introduction to the problem of the abuse of the Internet by racist fanatics and a discussion of the difficulties that we face in attempting to deal with this serious issue.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Jerry Turk's remarks to be placed in the THE RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to give them thoughtful consideration. This is a matter of considerable impor-

tance, and we in the Congress need to be aware of it.

"HATE ON THE INTERNET," REMARKS BY JERRY TURK, PRESIDENT OF THE LAS VEGAS OFFICE OF THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE (ADL)

Just for the moment this evening, I would like to ask each one of you for a favor. Please imagine yourself sitting at your computer, accessing the Internet—whether through America On Line, Netscape, Microsoft's Explorer, or whatever—and being told you have E-mail. Then, upon checking your mail, you read the following message:

Subject: "Idiotic Jews who waste their lives away."

Message: All you worthless Jews should go to hell, together with your lame-ass skull caps.

Die, you worthless, good for nothing, Christ-killers."

This is a portion of an actual E-mail that was sent to thousands of people, which was turned over to the Anti-Defamation League by a recipient that was a subscriber to a Jewish issues publication.

The ADL, which was founded 85 years ago, is in the forefront of the struggle for civil rights in America. ADL, through its many offices, combats all forms of prejudice, bigotry, anti-semitism, discrimination and hate.

Our Las Vegas offices has existed for about two years, and because of the help of many of you who are here this evening, it has made great progress in carrying out its mission. However, in spite of all of our accomplishments, Hate on the Internet is posing a new, very formidable challenge. ADL is working towards meeting this challenge. However, this task is not easy, as "High-Tech Hate" is not only growing, but is becoming more diverse. Let me give you some examples:

On one of a number of Ku Klux Klan web sites, one can play the Klan's version of hangman. The user gets to hang a character called, and I quote, "Leroy", an African-American male. Once you have completed the lynching, the computer screams, "you win"; or

Perhaps you are aware that the holocaust was a fraud and it never happened. Allow me to quote from a notorious holocaust denier's web site: "For fifty years the press, Hollywood, radio, television, and public schools have saturated us with the story that the National Socialist government of Germany carried out an extermination program against the Jews. This is the famous Jewish Holocaust, in which Jews claim six million of their kind were gassed, burned, and made into soap and lamp shades by the Germans. European and American historians and researchers, mostly non-Germans, have shown conclusively that the Holocaust story is a complete fraud.

"Why would such a monstrous fraud be attempted in the first place? The answer is billions of dollars in extortion money, political power, and Jewish racial/cultural solidarity. The Holocaust is used to extort hundreds of billions of dollars from American and German taxpayers"; or

The following passage from the same site, which site by the way, runs in excess of 10 pages:

"The Diary of Anne Frank was shown in 1980 to be another crude example of hate propaganda. In a series of court cases the entire diary was definitively shown to have been written by the same person, but that person often used ball-point pen ink which was not manufactured until 1951, years after Anne Frank's death from disease! The fact that many people still believe this hoax shows the effectiveness of Jewish control in our media and schools, where children in America, Germany and elsewhere are still forced to read this Jewish hate propaganda.

Finally, from David Duke on Tiger Woods from his extensive web site:

"A number of White men will be suckered in by a wave of admiration and emotion for one Black golf player into believing that the Black race can fit in and do well among the White race. That is simply untrue. Some individual Blacks obviously can. But, as a whole, the race cannot. For the mental abilities that go into the making and maintaining of a civilization are not the same as the requirements for a great golf player. The qualities that account for the advancing and maintaining of a scientific and civilized society are simply not the same as the qualities to run a 100 meters under 10 seconds or dunk a basketball, or for that matter, break the Masters record as a rookie.

With the avalanche of equality propaganda, millions who admire Woods might pleasantly imagine that an unknown Black young man who wants to move into the apartment next door will be like a Tiger Woods. The truth is that he is exponentially more likely to be like a Willie Horton or a Rodney King."

As you can see, the World Wide Web is fertile ground for hate-mongers with hate ideas. Our children are especially vulnerable to these materials, because they are most likely to accept them as fact. At the end of 1997, there were an estimated 56 million people in the United States using the Internet. It is estimated that by the end of 1998 this number will grow to 75 million.

Anyone can legally start a site on the Internet, and once started they can published anything they please. There is no requirement that the author of a web site accurately identify him or herself. The same is true of a user of a web site. Hate messages on the Internet have been likened to anonymous phone calls or letters, except these messages can be sent simultaneously to hundreds of thousands of people. These bigots can spew their hatred without ever running the risk of being identified. Unlike traditional media, where publishers, editors and reviewers are able to separate out lies and distortions, the Internet makes all kinds of information available.

As these individuals and organizations spread their venom across the World Wide Web, what can we do—what can the ADL do? I can tell you the ADL is struggling on how to combat this hate in whatever form it takes. The dilemma here, however, is how to expose this filth and help protect people from it, without violating our first amendment rights.

One approach ADL is taking is working with America On Line to design software that will filter out all sites it considers to be engaged in the spread of hate. However, all ADL can do is make a recommendation to the user, because in the final analysis, each individual user will have to make their own choice.

ADL, nationally, as well as here in Las Vegas, is working diligently to address these and other equally important issues. But it cannot do so without your help. We need your help now to build our Las Vegas ADL office into the leader it has to be for our community.

If you truly care about the Las Vegas Valley; if you truly care about the intellectual environment our children are exposed to; if you truly care about the future of our community, you will support the Anti-Defamation League. I need you, ADL's board needs you, the community needs you, but most importantly, your family needs you—to help. Please help. Please be there. Remember, if not you—then who?

TRIBUTE TO JOHN BELFORTE

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor John Belforte, upon his retirement as an extraordinary educator for forty-three years.

John Belforte served for three years during the Korean War before choosing to pursue a career in education. He earned his Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts degrees from San Francisco State University and embarked upon a life dedicated to education. He was an elementary school teacher for five years, and an elementary, intermediate and middle school administrator for a combined thirty-eight years.

Under John Belforte's guidance, numerous projects were undertaken and accomplished at Bowditch Middle School, including a TV/Radio Broadcast Studio, three computer labs, a planetarium, tennis courts, technology work stations in each classroom, an enlarged intramural sports program, a conflict resolution program, student selected scheduling and programming, and the highly successful Bowditch Means Business, an innovative business and school partnership.

During his tenure as Principal of Bowditch Middle School and as a result of John Belforte's efforts, the school was designated by the U.S. Department of Education as a Blue Ribbon School and a California State Department of Education Recognized School of Excellence.

John Belforte served as President of the Jefferson Elementary School District Teachers Association, president of the San Mateo County Teachers Association, Regional President of the Association of California School Administrators, a member of Phi Delta Kappa and the College of Notre Dame Faculty Advisory Committee.

John Belforte has given generously of his time and talents to our community, serving as a Commissioner on the San Mateo County Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as a Board Member of the Human Investment Project and Beresford-Hillsdale Homeowners Association. He's been recognized by the Foster City Rotary and Toastmasters International for his outstanding achievements and contributions, and San Francisco State University for his distinguished service as a member of the Advisory Committee to the Department of Education. His extensive involvement was recognized by the City of Foster City which issued a Proclamation naming May 31, 1990 as John Belforte Day.

Throughout his distinguished career, John Belforte has earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues and peers for his dedication and his effectiveness in improving our educational system. He has touched the lives of countless students and served as an inspiration to many. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating John Belforte on his retirement, thanking him for his tireless efforts and dedication, and wishing him all the best in the years ahead.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MICKEY COX ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Clovis Unified School District's Mickey Cox Elementary School for being recognized as a "California Distinguished School." Mickey Cox Elementary has educated students with great success over the years and has served as a tremendous catalyst to the community. The faculty and students of Mickey Cox Elementary exemplify excellence in student achievement and are very deserving of this recognition.

At its inception, in 1980, Mickey Cox was built by the Clovis Unified School District in an outlying rural area in the northern section of Clovis. From the outset, Mickey Cox came together as a school community with a definite vision rooted in a district philosophy and goals.

The foundation of Mickey Cox lies within the concept of being a community-centered school. The strength of their community lies within its diversity—socially, economically and ethnically. Mickey Cox enjoys an unusually high degree of volunteer support from the community. Parents are encouraged and feel comfortable in participating as classroom helpers and participants in a variety of school activities. The community helps to provide the financial support to sustain the curricular activities offered by the school. Community expectations for high academic standards, co-curricular participation and traditional values have been framed within the context of a caring community. All members of the school community work toward developing sustained achievement and social development in their students.

Mickey Cox prepares all students for the challenges of the 21st century by developing confidence and skills in critical thinking through participation in a wide range of goal-oriented experiences. The concept of nurturing the whole child is emphasized through monthly award assemblies of selected students who demonstrate strength in mind, body and spirit. They believe student recongition is essential in helping students strive toward mastery of academic, physical, and social-emotional development. The school motto is: "If it's to be, it's up to me." Mickey Cox maintains a rich tradition of recognizing student achievement and school involvement deemed important by the entire community.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I congratulate Clovis Unified School District's Mickey Cox Elementary School for being recognized as a "California Distinguished School." I applaud both the school and the community for their commitment to our children's lives. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Mickey Cox Elementary many more years of success.

THE RETIREMENT OF JOHN WARD, "THE VOICE OF THE VOLS"

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, as many people here in Washington know, I am a tremendous fan of the University of Tennessee Athletic Teams.

For more than thirty years, John Ward has been known throughout the Nation as the "Voice of the Vols." During that time Mr. Ward has made millions of fans feel like they were sitting in the stands even though they were only able to listen over the radio.

He has been acclaimed with a reputation as one of the finest sports announcers in the history of this Nation.

Even more importantly, he has become one of the most respected and admired men in East Tennessee and has been a true friend to many many people throughout our part of the Country.

John Ward has now announced his retirement as the football and basketball broadcaster for the Tennessee Volunteers after one more season. When he leaves he will certainly be missed by countless numbers of Tennessee sports fans and will be almost impossible to replace.

I would like to offer my congratulations to John Ward on a job well done and wish him the best for the future.

I would like to call to the attention of all my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several articles and editorials from the Knoxville News Sentinel.

A LEGEND STEPS DOWN

JOHN WARD, BILL ANDERSON WILL END LONG BROADCASTING STINT NEXT YEAR

At the University of Tennessee, student-athletes come and go with regularity. Less frequently, the school changes presidents, vice presidents, deans, coaches and even athletic directors. And life goes on.

What has not changed in the past 30-plus years at UT is the person broadcasting football and basketball games, John Ward.

When Ward steps down as the "Voice of the Vols" after the 1998 football season and the '98-99 basketball season, life will go on but will be very different. Bill Anderson, the former UT football player who has been the color commentator and sidekick to Ward's play-by-play announcing, also will bow out next year. They are the longest-running broadcast pair in Division I-A college football.

Ward, who has broadcast UT football games for 30 years and Vols basketball games for 34 years, called a press conference last Wednesday to announce that he will retire following one more season behind the microphone. Succinctly he said, "It's time."

Edwin Huster, Vol Network general manager, promises a national search by the university, the athletic department and the network for Ward's replacement. The new broadcast team likely will be named by May of next year.

But how does UT or the network replace an institution? University President Joe Johnson said he would prefer the headache of picking head coaches, athletic directors or chancellors to finding a successor to Ward.

As much as Ward's longevity and steady voice at the mike, he will be remembered for the detail, the fairness and, most of all, the colorful way he announced UT's games.

Ah, yes, the color. How does one improve on, "Give him six"? Or dragging out the last five yards of a long touchdown romp as though the runner suddenly lapsed into slow motion: "He's at the five, the four, the three, the two, the one . . ." Or, with field goals, expanding the word "good" to about 10 syllables?

In basketball, Ward might not have patented the term "bottom," but can anyone deliver it any better? And who can forget the basketball glory days of "Ernie G. of Tennessee" or "Bernard KING of the Volunteers" from the mid-1970s?

Such are the things of legend, and, in the world of college football and basketball broadcasting, Ward's legendary status is assured. We wish him and Anderson the best in retirement.

Meanwhile, thanks for giving us one more year.

JOHN WARD, VOICE OF THE VOLS, TO RETIRE
(By Mike Strange)

John Ward revealed his scenario Wednesday, envisioning the aftermath of his retirement as the voice of University of Tennessee athletics.

"Game one," Ward said, "people listening will say, 'That sure doesn't sound like John Ward.'"

"Game three, people will say, 'I wonder what John Ward's doing today?'"

"Game five, people will say, 'What was the name of that guy who used to broadcast Tennessee games?'"

That's one call Ward will blow.

The man revered as "The Voice of the Vols" announced he will retire following one more football and basketball season behind the microphone. However, it's not likely he will be forgotten by UT fans until well into the 21st century, if then.

After 30 seasons of broadcasting Tennessee football and 34 describing basketball, Ward called a press conference that ended several years of speculation as to when he would step down.

"It's time," he said.

Because of his commitment to sponsors who already had signed on for the coming year and to allow for a more deliberate search for his replacement, Ward agreed to one more season.

Bill Anderson, his color commentary sidekick for all 30 football seasons, also will bow out with Ward. They are the longest-running broadcast tandem in Division I-A college football.

"He's seen head coaches come and go, and he's seen athletic directors come and go," said UT head football Coach Phillip Fulmer. "And John has remained the rock that has always been there."

"That won't change for a number of years. He may retire from being there every day, but he won't leave the minds of Tennessee people."

Ward, who has always been secretive about his age, is believed to be 68. He said he had considered retirement "for three or four years" before arriving at what finally seemed to be the right time.

"I didn't make this decision all by myself," Ward said. "My wife was involved, the university, some of the sponsors we visited with."

He added, "I know the decision now is correct, and the time is correct."

Why? Ward said he had jotted down a list of 22 factors, ranging from health to commitment to the travel to the hours of preparation to the quality of the product.

"It's not a matter of where I think I've slipped very much," he said. "I did a great job this year, compared to other years."

UT President Joe Johnson said he preferred the dilemma of hiring head coaches,

athletic directors or chancellors to the daunting prospect of replacing an institution of Ward's stature.

Doug Dickey, men's athletics director since 1985, was the Vols' head football coach when Ward slid behind the microphone in 1968.

"When 107,000 show up for football games or 24,000 come for basketball games, part of that legacy and building that goes to John Ward and Bill Anderson," Dickey said.

Dickey said before the search process for Ward's replacement begins, UT must renegotiate its broadcast rights. The current contract with Host Communications expires in July 1999.

Edwin Huster, Vol Network general manager, said a national search will be conducted by the university, the athletic department and the network. A new broadcast team will be named by May 1999.

"This is the day I and all Tennessee fans hoped would never come," Huster said. "Where do we go next? Good question."

Ward prefers to sit out that process.

"I think it would be better to have a detached, methodical search," Ward said.

The two most often-mentioned candidates among UT fans are WBIR-TV's Bob Kesling and Mike Keith, who recently left WNOX/WIVK radio to become broadcast director for the NFL Tennessee Oilers.

Both are UT graduates and Vol Network veterans who got their respective starts under the Ward regime.

"John set such a high standard," Kesling said. "And he gives the Tennessee fans exactly what they want, so the next guy who follows him is going to have it pretty tough."

Keith said he was "shocked" by Ward's announcement, adding, "It's neat that he set himself up to go out on top of his game. The last year, when basketball was good again, you got to hear what really made him special."

Kesling was recently named top play-by-play man for the Jefferson Pilot SEC weekly football telecasts for 1998. He has made no secret of the fact that he considers the UT job a desirable career move.

Keith said he would "certainly pick up the phone and listen" if UT called, but added, "I'm very happy where I am."

WARD HAS TAKEN UT FANS ON A GREAT RIDE

Ed Balloff lost his job Wednesday.

Don't worry, he has another one, and he doesn't need the money. He is a retired LaFollette, businessman who eight years ago began a second career as a hotshot 72-year-old public defender.

You might know him as a credit line at the end of John Ward's University of Tennessee basketball broadcasts: "Transportation provided by Ed Balloff."

Balloff, 80, was in court Wednesday morning. Otherwise, he would have been at Ward's press conference.

Ward called Balloff on Tuesday to tell his longtime friend that this would be his last year as the voice of UT football and basketball. "It's time," said Ward, announcing succinctly, dramatically that the next season would end 35 years of basketball and 31 of football.

And thousands of miles on the road with Ed Balloff.

Balloff and Ward became friends in the mid-'70s. In the more than 20 years that followed, they realized they shared more than a passion for Tennessee basketball.

"I couldn't have a better friend than John Ward," Balloff said.

They aren't just friends. They are as much a team as Ward and Bill Anderson, Ward's radio sidekick on UT football broadcasts for the last 30 years. Their booth is Balloff's car.

Balloff, who doesn't fly, began driving Ward to SEC basketball games during the glory days of Ernie Grunfeld and Bernard King (1974-77). They once drove all the way to New York for a National Invitation Tournament game. They have driven home from games in Baton Rouge, La., and Oxford, Miss., when they didn't make it back to Knoxville before dawn's first light.

But their landmark trips was to Lexington, Ky., in January of 1976. After that, their return-trip conversations were never the same.

As Balloff watched the game from the UT bench, he became more and more nervous. When the game went into overtime, he couldn't take it.

He went into a men's room, turned on all the faucets and began flushing the toilets—anything to muffle the roar of the crowd that only could mean bad news for UT. Finally, when he detected a silence beyond the men's room, he ventured outside to see all the sad Kentucky faces. The Vols had won in overtime, 90-88.

The games didn't get any easier for Balloff after that. Watching made him too nervous, so he either paced the corridors of the arena or dropped Ward off at the game, returned to the hotel and picked him up afterward. Ward told him what happened on the way home.

So, in effect, Ward did for Balloff what he did for Vols fans everywhere. He gave him a front-row seat at a UT basketball game.

"He's great at painting a picture of a game," Balloff said. Former Knoxville Journal sports editor Ben Byrd said the same thing.

Byrd remembers the first time he heard Ward broadcast a high school game. "From the first day; you knew then he would be good," Byrd said, "because he could keep up with the action of a basketball game."

In football, Ward has made a point of trailing the play, of prolonging the call emphatically past the TD run: "5 . . . 4 . . . 3 . . ." That countdown is as much a part of Ward's distinctive repertoire as "Give him six" and "It's footballtime in Tennessee."

Bob P. Prince was one of my favorite broadcasters. Never mind that his station was in Pittsburgh, and my radio was in Clinton, La. Sandwiched between a rock'n roll station in Meridian, Miss., and a Spanish-speaking station from who knows where, KDKA still could be heard on most nights in the early and mid-'60s. Even now, I think I could pick out that longago voice of the Pirates amidst static and song.

In Prince's vernacular, a flyball to Roberto Clemente was a "can of corn," a Pirate on the basepaths was a "bug on the rug." Those lines, that voice, assured me that all was right with the world.

For more than three decades, Ward has done as much for Tennessee football and basketball. There's no mistaking his voice or call. The voice has bridged generation gaps and taken its listeners from high school to the high point of their careers.

"I listened to him as a high school athlete," UT football coach Philip Fulmer said. "We used to have to drive to the top of a hill late on Saturday night to get the signal."

"I remember a particular (broadcast), the UCLA game when Kenny DeLong made a big catch. The energy and enthusiasm (of Ward) affected me because he was in the process of deciding where I wanted to go to school."

It was Ward's time to make a decision Wednesday, and UT fans shouldn't be saddened by it. Like Peyton Manning, he gave them one more year.

Balloff gladly will provide the transportation.

POSTHUMOUS TRIBUTE TO MR.
STEVEN J. CRANMAN

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of Miami-Dade's indefatigable leaders, Mr. Steven J. Cranman. His untimely demise last Wednesday, June 3, 1998 leaves a deep void in our community.

Mr. Cranman was attending the Annual Conference of the American Economic Development Council in Nashville, Tennessee when he was felled by a massive stroke. He was barely 42 years old.

A rare South Florida native, Steven was born in Miami Beach. He virtually consecrated his life to public service, and represented the best and the noblest of our community's leadership. He was one selfless hero who dedicated everything he got to the residents of South Dade, who were rendered homeless and almost hopeless by the 1992 devastation of Hurricane Andrew, the deadliest disaster ever to wreck havoc on any community in the United States. Known as a man of limitless passion for the well-being of his fellowmen, he was the leader par excellence who went out of his way to create a convergence of community leaders and common folks alike to focus in on the socio-economic recovery of countless families through the infusion of employment opportunities.

The Perrine-Cutler Ridge community deeply feels the loss of a truly decent and caring man who made it his personal business to reach out to the needs of his neighbors. His relentless efforts in helping South Dade rise from Hurricane Andrew's ashes through economic development and job creation garnered him a prestigious award from the International Association of Personnel in Employment Security. He was also recognized as the 1997 Florida Economic Development Council's District 9 Professional of the Year for his dogged determination in recruiting companies, which subsequently led to the creation of new employment opportunities for the people of South Dade.

The numerous accolades with which various organizations and agencies have honored him through the years symbolize the unequivocal testimony of the utmost respect and admiration he enjoyed from a grateful community. He truly epitomized the resilience and compassion of a community leader whose life served as an example of how much difference each of us can make in behalf of our community's well-being.

This is the legacy Steven Cranman bequeathed to us. I am greatly privileged indeed to have known him as my good friend.

IN HONOR OF MARSHALL W.
"MAJOR" TAYLOR

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Marshall W. "Major" Taylor, a championed cyclist during the late 1800s and early

1900s, for his unyielding perseverance and strength in the face of discrimination.

In recognition of his excellence in the sport of racing and his personal struggle for justice and equality, the Seven Hills Wheelman bicycle club of Worcester renamed its annual 100-mile ride the Major Taylor Century. I stand before you today to pay tribute to an outstanding athlete and admirable citizen.

In spite of widespread racism, the "Worcester Whirlwind," as he was nicknamed by his fans, valiantly pursued his passion for cycling. Taylor endured threats and physical assaults, yet rose to excellence in defiance of Jim Crow segregation laws that permeated the country as well as the sport of cycling.

In 1900, Taylor won the American sprint championship race, ultimately proving that hard work and perseverance can have glorious rewards.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to take a moment to join me in honoring Major Taylor for his athletic ability and his sportsmanship in the face of intolerance.

IN HONOR OF ARTHUR BROWN

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Arthur B. Brown who celebrates his 90th birthday this week.

Mr. Brown was born on the Upper East Side of Manhattan in 1908 to Hungarian immigrants. After the death of his father when he was only 17 years old, Mr. Brown was forced to quit high school and work to support his family. At 20, he became the youngest person to become a licensed plumber in the city of New York.

Mr. Brown's successful business and his genuine understanding of the plumbing profession lead to his invention of the Holby Tempering Valve, an instrument which is now used around the world.

The success of Mr. Brown's business has enabled him to acquire considerable real estate on the Upper East Side, as well as an off-Broadway theater called Theater East which he has owned since 1954.

Beyond his professional life, his commitment to his community is remarkable. Mr. Brown is one of the longest members of Community Board #8 in Manhattan, a board he has been a part of since 1967; he is also a member of the East Manhattan Chamber of Commerce; the 19th Precinct Community Council; the 17th Precinct Community Council; the Central Park Community Council.

Mr. Brown has long been an advocate for the elderly in New York City, most notably as vice president of the New York Foundation of Senior Citizens. In light of these impressive credentials, it is only fitting that the senior citizen housing located at 225 East 93rd Street was named the Arthur and William Brown Gardens after himself and his brother.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues rise with me in this tribute to Mr. Arthur Brown. He has faithfully served his family and his community for decades and his work for Manhattan is without question worth recognizing. I am proud to have Arthur Brown as a constituent.

STATEMENT ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the National Institute of Dental Research. The National Institute of Dental Research (NIDR) was established on June 24, 1948 by the National Dental Research Act. I am pleased to have this opportunity to recognize all NIDR researchers and scientists for 50 years of hard work and dedication.

The NIDR has had a leadership role in improving and promoting dental health. As a former dentist myself, I know first-hand how important this research is for every American. The NIDR supports biomedical and behavioral research in its own laboratories and in public, private, and academic research centers across the nation. It also promotes oral health worldwide through its sponsorship of international meetings and information exchanges.

The NIDR has dedicated 50 years to researching tooth loss and other related diseases and disorders, including AIDS, osteoporosis, oral cancer, arthritis, and diabetes. Through its research on preventive and diagnostic strategies, the NIDR has contributed to a dramatic improvement in the oral health of the American people. This research saves Americans over four billion dollars in dental expenses every year!

Mr. Speaker, the National Institute of Dental Research has been instrumental in the nationwide decline of oral and dental disease. I wholeheartedly support the NIDR and appreciate its many contributions to dental health over the past 50 years.

IN HONOR OF GRAND CHANCELLOR
SIR WILLIAM D. RUBIN

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today as we commend our dear friend and leader, one of the pillars of our community, Grand Chancellor William Rubin.

Born and raised in Brooklyn, Grand Chancellor Rubin was educated in the New York Public School System, graduating from New Utrecht High School, and completing Hunter College. Upon his graduation he began what would become an eighteen year career at a prestigious major building and real estate organization, moving up to the position of supervisor construction.

Sir William, a self-motivated individual, was also employed for many years as President of Sabil Management and Bilken Construction Corporation, companies specializing in many different areas, such as real estate investment and general contracting. His expertise in these fields led him to become President of various corporations, including Seabreeze Associations. In 1958, Bill married Zelda Schwartz, also a loyal Pythian, and they now have three beautiful children, all of whom have completed

prestigious universities and are flourishing professionals.

Through the years, Mr. Rubin has also been an active participant in community affairs. He has served in many leadership positions for various organizations such as the United Democratic Organization, the NYS Senate Staff, and the Hadassah and Deborah Hospitals. He has also been an extremely active member of the Genesis Lodge. These time and effort consuming activities were all in addition to his involvement in the Pythian Organization as Grand Chancellor and member of the Grand Lodge Committees.

Grand Chancellor Rubin's determined and altruistic personality makes him a natural leader in community affairs. His various involvements have not gone unnoticed; he has been rewarded with various distinguished awards and honors, including the Man of the Year Award, the Distinguished Service Award, Humanitarian Award, Life Membership Memorial Award, and the most coveted of all honors, The Degree of the Golden Spur.

We are proud and honored to welcome home the Grand Chancellor of the Pythian Knights, William Rubin. His leadership abilities and qualities, as well as his concern for the community make him a true role model and friend.

DEMOCRACY TRANSITION PACKAGE

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the third bill in my Democracy Transition Package, a resolution that would return the District's limited right to vote on the House floor in the Committee of the Whole to the rules package for the 106th Congress. I ask Congress to return the delegate vote that I won in the 103rd Congress out of respect for the more than half million taxpaying residents whom I represent. This vote was withdrawn from all five delegates in the 104th Congress, but, as I will indicate, I do not believe the withdrawal was an act focused on the District and its unique circumstances as the home of the only taxpaying residents without full congressional representation. The repeal was wrapped in a package of rules, and the District was never considered individually. On behalf of my constituents, to whom the vote is deeply meaningful, I ask my colleagues to support this important measure.

Without disparaging the rights of the other delegates to seek the return of their votes, I base my request on the unique responsibilities and equities particular to the District of Columbia. I supported the rationale of the decision that gave all the delegates the vote in the Committee of the Whole, namely that, historically, delegates have been accorded the same treatment. At the same time, there are important differences between the District and the territories, most notably, that the District is subject to federal income taxes.

The unique circumstances and equities that argue for a vote for the District can be embodied in four principles.

Principle No. 1—I represent the only Americans who pay federal income taxes but have no vote on the House floor; my constituents pay \$1.7 billion annually in federal income taxes, making them third per capita among the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The District is the only territory under the jurisdiction of the United States whose citizens are subject to every obligation of citizenship, notably federal taxation, but remain barred from sending a voting representative to the House and Senate. Unlike the delegate from the District, the delegates from American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands do not represent citizens who pay federal income taxes. Yet, fortunately, they enjoy full self-government and the District does not, and they are afforded the same representation in Congress as the District.

Principle No. 2—I represent the only Americans whose budget governing the expenditure of their own locally raised tax dollars must be enacted by the Congress. The passage of the President's Revitalization package ensures that nearly all of the District's local budget will now be D.C. taxpayer-raised revenues. As the first measure in my Democracy Transition package and with the support of the President, I introduced a bill that would eliminate the D.C. Appropriations subcommittees in the Congress to reflect this important change.

Principle No. 3—I represent the only Americans who do not enjoy full democratic self-government. The four territories, like the states and localities, are self governing under accepted principles of democracy without interference from the Congress. Under the Home Rule Act of 1973, the Congress reserves and exercises the right to revoke and change the laws and budget of the District consisting of locally raised revenues. As the second measure in my Democracy Transition package, I introduced a bill that would allow the District to enact its own laws free of Congressional approval.

Principle No. 4—I represent more than a half million residents, a population more than some Congressional districts.

The District Court of the District of Columbia and the Court of Appeals for this circuit have ruled that there is no constitutional impediment to extending voting rights to delegates in the House to the Committee of the Whole. Article I, Section 5, Clause 2 which states that, "Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings" is the constitutional basis for this ruling. Had the case gone against the House, an extraordinary precedent for intrusion by the courts into the Rules and proceedings of this body that no one in the House desires would have resulted.

The House granted a limited right to delegates to vote in the Committee of the Whole on the basis of a legal memorandum that I prepared that was factually grounded in the District's taxpaying status. The other territories were granted the vote at the same time to avoid differential treatment, although, of course, taxpaying status legitimately sets the District apart from the residents of the territories, who do not pay federal income taxes to the federal treasury. Subsequently, the courts approved delegate voting as granted by the Rules of the House, removing any legal or constitutional question.

My vote in the Committee of the Whole still left taxpaying District citizens without a vote in the formal House and without any vote in the Senate. To avoid any constitutional question, a re-vote requirement provided that a delegate's vote would never decide an issue before the Committee of the Whole if the delegate's vote provided the deciding margin.

the work of the Committee of the Whole is no more final than that of standing committees, such as Transportation and Infrastructure and Judiciary, where Delegates have long had the vote. Therefore, nothing done in the Committee of the Whole is final until the full House acts. My constituents do not assert that they yet meet the constitutional requirements for full voting membership in the House, inasmuch as the District is not a state. What my constituents do meet each and every day is each and every obligation of citizenship, including paying every federal tax paid by other American citizens, serving in the armed forces, and being subject to all obligations required by the nation's laws. District residents have fought and died in every war since the American Revolution and sent more citizens to fight the nation's most recent war, Operation Desert Storm, than did 47 states.

Most Americans today would almost surely agree that citizens who are third per capita in federal income taxes should have the right to vote in the Committee of the Whole if that is constitutionally permissible. Denying me my vote in the Committee of the Whole punishes hard working taxpaying Americans. The House gains by adherence to its often expressed democratic principles while losing nothing if my vote is returned. It would mean a great deal to the people I represent at this critical time in the life of the nation's capital. Disempowering me cannot help in my work to help dispel the District's current problems.

A vote in the Committee of the Whole would give District residents a vote on most matters—several steps up from being a representative confined to debating while other Members vote on her local laws and her local taxpayer raised budget and revenues. In a body that justifiably gives great deference to taxpaying Americans, allowing a vote to a jurisdiction that ranks higher in federal income taxes than almost all others is a matter of simple justice.

The unique taxpaying status of my constituents, the unique privilege this body assumes of appropriating locally raised taxpayer revenue, the unique requirement to bring each and every action taken to the local city council to a body in which residents have no voting representation, and the significant population of the District makes the District's case unique. The vote in the Committee of the Whole should be granted to the District, considering the principle that produced the nation itself: no taxation without representation. Under these circumstances, the House should do all that is constitutionally permissible. I ask my colleagues to restore my limited voting rights in the House and afford the respect that the residents of the nation's capital are due.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL HEFNER

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my good friend Paul Hefner, who has just completed a remarkably successful tenure as President of the Greater San Fernando Chamber of Commerce. In 1997, Paul began his one-year term as Chairman of the San Fernando Chamber of Commerce. Under Paul's able leadership, the Chamber has grown and engaged in a series of successful outreach efforts, which led to changing the name to the "Greater" San Fernando Chamber. Paul's affable personality and business experience proved to be of tremendous value in this effort.

For 25 years, Paul worked with First Interstate Bank of California. He began as a branch operations officer, and rose through the ranks to hold a number of senior positions, including Senior Vice President and Chief of Staff, Los Angeles Metro Division. He played a major role in creating the first multi-state First Interstate image and several automation projects, including Cirrus, the national automated teller machine network.

In 1989, Paul left First Interstate and formed his own business, Words in Motion, which he established in his hometown of San Fernando. Words in Motion is a unique business, one that reflects the strong spirituality of its founder. Paul's company specializes in the resolution of Christian church disputes, offering assistance to those seeking to resolve disputes in a biblically faithful manner.

I don't know whether Paul put this training to work as President of the San Fernando Chamber. What I do know is that by common consensus 1997-98 was one of the most productive years in Chamber history. In August, a few weeks after Paul assumed the chairmanship, The Chamber entered into a consulting services agreement with the City of San Fernando to conduct four key economic development programs for the business community. And under Paul's leadership the Chamber has changed from a primarily volunteer-based organization to one with a full-time, professional staff.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Paul Hefner, a great Chamber Chairman, an exceptional businessman and an extremely nice guy. I salute him for his extraordinary efforts on behalf of the business community of San Fernando and the Northeast San Fernando Valley.

HONORING DANIEL CARTER BEARD

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Daniel Carter Beard, the founder of the Boy Scouts of America, for his contributions to the young people of our country. I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the outstanding achievements of Daniel Carter Beard, who made his home in my Congres-

sional District in Suffern, which is located in Rockland County, New York. This year Rockland County, as part of its celebrations of its bicentennial, is honoring this distinguished former resident of our county.

On June 14th, the Hudson Valley Boy Scout Council/Rockland District of the Boy Scouts of America will be honoring Daniel Carter Beard with the dedication of a new bronze plaque. This dedication coincides with the Rockland County Bicentennial Celebration.

Born in Cincinnati, Ohio in 1850, Daniel Carter Beard enjoyed camping and exploring the wilderness as a child. This early interest sowed the seeds of a later passion for the outdoors and a career as an illustrator. Beard studied engineering at Covington, Kentucky and art at the Art Students League in New York City. By 1900, Beard had received national recognition for his illustrations in many wildlife and outdoor magazines.

In 1905, Beard became the editor of Recreation, a sportsmen magazine, which under his direction became a voice in wildlife conservation. Daniel Carter Beard also founded the Sons of Daniel Boone; a group dedicated to conservation, to the outdoor life, and the pioneer spirit. By 1909, he founded the Boy Pioneers of America. This group, like the Sons of Daniel Boone, was a way to improve the lives of urban youths, according to Beard.

Following the success of a youth movement in England, Beard worked to start the Boy Scouts of America which were chartered in 1910. As founder of the BSA, Beard designed the hat, shirt, and neckerchief to be worn as a symbol of the American frontier.

Beard appreciated the importance of preserving the dwindling frontier and felt it was important to stop the deterioration of the wilderness. He recognized that the frontier way of life was rapidly disappearing forever, and recognized the importance of preserving this rich heritage for future generations. He taught our young people how to camp, hunt, fish, and to appreciate their environment. The Boy Scouts of America continue to instruct these ideals and to preserve the teachings of Daniel Carter Beard.

Subsequently, Beard's personality made him a folk hero to many young men who attended his camp in Pennsylvania and read his articles in Boys Life. He became known as "Uncle Dan," with his public appearances wearing a buck skin suit, and his monthly columns describing his experiences in the wilderness.

Daniel Carter Beard died at the ripe age of 90, after living a life full of many experiences and accomplishments. His legacy lives on through his books, illustrations, and stories. Board was laid to rest at the Brick Church Cemetery, not far from his home, Brooklands, in Suffern. He has continued to touch the lives of America's youth with his contributions to scouting and wildlife conservation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Daniel Carter Beard. The Boy Scouts of America has been an important part of my of my life since my youth, and I recognize that it is an important outlet for young men to learn to appreciate their natural surroundings and to value all that nature has given us, and to hold character as they learn the importance of integrity, hard work, and brotherhood.

AMERICANS DON'T NEED SPEECH NANNIES

HON. TOM DELAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I submit to the RECORD Douglas Johnson's insightful and valuable analysis of campaign regulation proposals and their impact on freedom of speech. I hope my colleagues will examine it prior to supporting so-called campaign "reform" measures.

[From National Right to Life News, Sept. 30, 1997]

DO AMERICAN VOTERS NEED SPEECH NANNIES?

(By Douglas Johnson)

Many incumbent members of Congress are eager to provide America's voters with a new government service—a federal law to protect them from messages about politicians that may "manipulate" simple-minded voters, especially those communications that are "negative" in tone, or that will result in "unhealthy" debate.

Yes, if Senator John McCain, Senator Russ Feingold, Common Cause, and their allies get their way, federal legislators, political appointees, and FEC career speech regulators will become the political speech nannies for the rest of us. They will do their utmost to shield their fellow citizens from an excess of information and claims about politicians—conflicting messages that may confuse and befuddle them, or even trick them into voting for the "wrong" candidates.

If you do not regard yourself as being in need of such a service from your government, then maybe it's time for you to take a closer look at the McCain-Feingold bill. The latest revision, currently on the Senate floor, contains speech-nanny provisions that are even stronger than those found in earlier versions, and astonishing in their brazenness.

In recent days, the media have reported that the new bill would restrict broadcast ads that mention candidates within 60 days of an election. However, the bill actually contains multiple speech restrictions that sweep far more broadly than the 60-day provision.

The other, less publicized provisions encompass both print and broadcast communications—and apply year around. The bill would generally prohibit unions and corporations—including issue-advocacy groups such as National Right to Life, the ACLU, or the Sierra Club—from paying for communications to the public at any time of the year that federal regulators consider to be "for the purpose of influencing a federal election," if the sponsoring organization is deemed to have any of ten broad categories of links (direct or indirect, actual or presumed) to a candidate, including the mere sharing of professional vendors. "Candidate" includes all incumbent members of Congress, unless they have announced their retirement, starting the day after any election.

AND "EXCEPTION" THAT PROVES THE RULE

Sen. McCain has made much of what he calls an "exception" which he claims would protect the right to disseminate certain printed information about the voting records of Members of Congress and the positions of candidates, including so-called "voter-guides."

Actually, however, the so-called "exception" amounts to an elaborate set of "speech specifications," spelling out what type of information on politicians' votes and positions

the Congress would deign to permit. Among other specifications, such printed material would be verboten unless it is solely presented "in an educational manner," which is federal speech-regulation jargon meaning "no explicit or implicit value judgments allowed." The bill also contains an additional requirement that the communication must not contain "words that in context can have no reasonable meaning other than to urge the election or defeat of one or more clearly identified candidates."

This so-called "exception" would really operate as a ban on the sort of congressional voting "scorecards" and voter guides that are commonly disseminated by many issue-oriented citizen groups and unions. Typically, such materials reflect a viewpoint on the issues covered by the scorecard or voter guide. This viewpoint may be evident, for example, in the selection of issues and the way that they are characterized, through "positive" or "negative" rates of "grades," and through explicit commentary.

Such commentary is not an "abuse" or "evasion" of federal law. Rather, it is fully protected by the First Amendment, which is not a "loophole" but, among other things, the nation's paramount "election law."

Under the so-called "exception," however, a citizens' group such as NRLC, Inc., could not at any time of the year issue a brochure that contains the value-laden statement, "On May 20, 1997, Senator Russ Feingold voted to allow the brutal partial-birth abortion procedure to remain legal," without risk of facing an FEC investigation for engaging in advocacy against and "candidate." In addition, for 60 days before the primary or general election, NRLC, Inc., could not run an ad on the radio or TV that said simply, "Senator Russ Feingold voted against the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, H.R. 1122, on May 20, 1997."

Isn't this really "incumbent protection," big time? One of the few disadvantages of being an incumbent is the possibility of being called upon to defend one's actual votes on any of hundreds of issues. But the incumbents will have to do a lot less such defending, if the McCain-Feingold speech restrictions were in effect.

These restrictions would apply even to communications that ask citizens to take action with respect to approaching votes on critical issues in Congress. For example, prior to the September, 1996 votes in the U.S. House and U.S. Senate on whether to override President Clinton's veto of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, NRLC published brochures that asked readers to contact specific members of Congress (i.e., "candidates") who had previously voted against the bill in order to urge them to switch sides and vote to override the veto. Some did so. Other groups ran TV ads with similar messages.

ONLY PACS CAN SPEAK

Under the bill, it would remain lawful for a Political Action Committees (PAC) to utter the name or depict the likeness of a candidate before an election, so long as the PAC was able to avoid inadvertently violating the bill's Byzantine provisions defining impermissible "coordination," which include such things as merely paying for "the professional services of any person that has provided or is providing campaign-related services in the same election cycle" to a candidate who the PAC wishes to support. Running afoul of these "coordination" rules automatically limits the PAC's speech on behalf of a candidate to \$5,000.

A law that allows only PACs (and the news media) to speak about politicians would silence countless citizens' groups across the nation that do not have the resources to

meet the complex regulatory demands that are involved in operating a PAC (e.g., hiring accountants and lawyers with expertise in federal election law, filing complex reports, reporting the names and occupations of donors to the government, etc.).

Moreover, even groups that have connected PACs, such as NRLC, would be able to engage in far less politician-specific speech than now, which is precisely the goal of the speech-regulators. Current law places stringent rationing restrictions on PACs. Such PACs may solicit and accept donations only from individual members, donations are limited to \$5,000, and the names of all donors of over \$200 (under the bill, \$50) must be reported to the government, among other restrictions.

However, the Supreme Court has held that such government regulations may be applied only to communications that contain explicit words urging a vote for or against a candidate. The Court has held that "issue advocacy"—meaning citizen groups' commentary on politicians and their positions on issues—is core political expression and enjoys the highest degree of immunity under the First Amendment.

The Supreme Court's decisions do not allow this definition to be adjusted by federal or state legislative bodies, because that would allow precisely what is being attempted now—government control of the content and the amount of speech regarding the matters that are at the very core of the First Amendment's protections.

The Supreme Court did not adopt its narrow definition of "express advocacy" based on some native misperception that only messages that explicitly urge a "vote for" or "vote against" a specific candidate would influence voters. Rather, the Court explicitly recognized that many other types of speech regarding the merits of the positions and votes of candidates may sway voters (that's why they're called "voter guides"), but rejected limitations on such speech as alien to the First Amendment.

As the Court said in *Buckley v. Valeo*, "As long as persons and groups eschew expenditures that in express terms advocate the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate, they are free to spend as much as they want to promote the candidate and his views." [emphasis added] But under the McCain-Feingold bill, they cannot "spend as much as they want to promote the candidate and his views"—or even mention his name on the radio.

CONTROLLING POLITICAL DEBATE

Many of the arguments being offered to justify restrictions on private speech about politicians seem to flow from a preconception that certain political elites should define the proper parameters for political discourse—by force of law.

Burt Neuborne, legal director the Brennan Center for Justice (an organization devoted to seeking the overruling of *Buckley v. Valeo*), displayed this elitist mindset at a February 27 hearing before the House Judiciary Constitution Subcommittee. Neuborne commended the panel's chairman, Congressman Charles Canady (R-Fl.), "for the disciplined way the hearing has been run, and how carefully you maintained the ground rules that allowed real free speech to come out here. And I'm really saying that the same idea has to be thought of in the electoral process. * * * In a courtroom speech is controlled. In this room speech is controlled, and the net result is good speech."

Here, indeed, is a new vision of democracy—elections in which the government sits on high as a judge, decreeing who will speak, at what time, and for how long.

Or consider the words of Sen. McCain himself, who explained on September 26, "These

groups run ads that even the candidates who benefit from them often disapprove of. Further, these ads are almost always negative attacks on a candidate and do little to further healthy political debate." [emphasis added]

Where does Sen. McCain think he gets the authority to suppress commentary on politicians that he considers "negative" or "unhealthy"? And does he really imagine that it is constitutionally relevant whether or not candidates "disapprove of" the speech of citizens' groups?

Even more haughty are the words of Congressman Scotty Baesler (D-Ky.), who says that unless restrictions are placed on independent communications, "the candidate risks losing control over the tone, clarity, and content of his or her own campaign."

Whatever gave Mr. Baesler the outlandish notion that he has authority to control the tone or content of the debate that precedes an election? Elections are not the sole property of the candidates. The right to seek to persuade fellow citizens of what issues they should weigh heavily at election time is as fundamental as the right to vote itself. As the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit put it in *FEC v. CLITRIM*—one of the innumerable federal court decisions striking down various speech regulation schemes put forward by the Federal Election Commission—"the right to speak out at election time is one of the most zealously protected under the Constitution."

PROTECT THE DIMWITS?

We are told that ads and voters guides put out by citizens' groups influence elections—but just what does that mean? After all, none of the communications being debated—voter guides, scorecards, TV ads—can "influence elections" at all, except to the extent that they are given weight by registered voters.

Doesn't our constitutional system of government ultimately rest on the general premise that these people—grownups, American citizens—should be allowed to sort out the competing political messages (including those presented by the news media) without government-imposed filters or government-imposed counterspeech?

Restrictions on speech such as those contained in the McCain-Feingold bill seem to grow out of a "protect-the-dimwits" mindset—a usually unspoken premise among many members of certain political and media elites that we need laws to protect the poor perplexed voters from being manipulated by independent political voices.

For example: in an August 19 interview on CNN, Alan Baron, chief Democratic counsel for the campaign finance investigation of Sen. Fred Thompson's Governmental Affairs Committee, suggested that there is something improper or illicit about the voter guides that the Christian Coalition distributes by the millions. These leaflets typically summarize the positions of two or more candidates on from five to fifteen issues.

These voter guides "are manipulated," Mr. Baron complained. "Certain issues are emphasized in one election and then deemphasized in another election. They are clearly intended—based on everything I have discovered about them—they are intended to manipulate the voter into voting a certain way, usually for very conservative Republican candidates."

(This is pretty sinister stuff—"manipulating" voters into looking more favorably on certain types of candidates by talking about their positions on certain issues and not other issues. What will happen if the AFL-CIO, Handgun Control, the Sierra Club, and the National Abortion and Reproductive

Rights Action League—or, for that matter, the League of Women Voters—find out about this trick?)

Clearly, in Mr. Baron's eyes, the Christian Coalition voter guides "in context can have no reasonable meaning other than to urge the election or defeat of one or more clearly identified candidates," and are deficient in maintaining the proper "educational manner" that would be required by law under the McCain-Feingold bill.

But mind you, when Mr. Baron says that the Christian Coalition's voter guides "manipulate voters," he does not mean sophisticated voters such as himself. No, if a smart Washington insider like Mr. Baron received a Christian Coalition voter guide, he would decide whether or not the issues discussed were the issues he considered salient, compare the information presented there to the information available from other sources, and reach his own judgment. But there are so many other voters out there in the hinterlands who Mr. Baron knows lack his powers of discernment, and it is they who are in need of the speech nannies that McCain-Feingold would provide.

This is a very steep and slippery slope. Those who hold or seek office are human, which means they don't like to be criticized. If speech-regulating legislators can get the courts to back off and use legal restrictions to reduce the amount of unpleasant stimuli to which they are subjected—and be applauded for their unselfish "reform" efforts to boot—we can expect that the scope and duration such restrictions will rapidly expand in all directions.

For example, Congressman Sam Farr (D-Ca.), author of the "campaign reform" bill sponsored by the House Democratic leadership, wrote that "material that is written in such a way that the recipient is left with the clear impression that the material advocates support or defeat of a particular political candidate or party—even without naming that candidate or party—would constitute express advocacy and would fall under the scope of campaign expenditure laws." (emphasis added)

In the same vein, Senator Max Cleland (D-Ga.) recently complained to the Associated Press about what he call "independent expenditure" ads on TV that asked his constituents to urge him to vote for the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, shortly before the Senate passed the bill on May 20. (He didn't.) These ads demonstrated the need for "campaign reform" legislation such as the McCain-Feingold bill, Sen. Cleland fumed. Sen. Cleland is not up for re-election for 5½ years.

On ABC This Week for September 28, George Will asked Democratic National Committee General Chairman Roy Romer if the National Right to Life Committee should be able to buy pre-election newspaper ads that decry partial-birth abortions, if the ads do not name a candidate. The Colorado governor replied, "I think you ought to separate that from the time of the election. You've got twelve months during a year." Only when challenged by an incredulous Will did Romer graciously allow that "if it doesn't mention the candidate's name, you could probably leave it unregulated."

Rather than go down this path, we should heed the words of the Supreme Court in *Buckley v. Valeo*: "In the free society ordained by our Constitution it is not the government, but the people—individually as citizens and candidates and collectively as associations and political committees—who must retain control over the quantity and range of debate on public issues in a political campaign."

In other words, let's respect our elected officials and the demanding offices that they

hold. But let's not be such dimwits that we allow them to start telling us when, how, or how much we can talk about their voting records.

TRIBUTE TO TREVOR OLSON

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell you about a child in my congressional district in Bakersfield, California who is battling chest and lung cancer at the young age of eleven. His name is Trevor Olson. Trevor's parents, John and Karen, and younger brother and sister, Taylor and Leanne, have been a special source of love and support during this ordeal. However, it is Trevor's courage and heroism that provide an example to all of the people that know him and learn his story, that even the youngest of us can respond to extraordinary circumstances with bravery. I believe this young American's story needs to be shared.

On June 13th the people of Bakersfield will respond to Trevor's battle by granting a wish Trevor has had for a long time. That wish is to ride in a race car. Hospice, a local health-care clinic for the critically ill, and Young-Woolridge, a local law firm, will sponsor the televised event. Gary Collins, an internationally known race car driver, will drive Trevor. I am pleased that Hospice, an organization known for their compassion and assistance to those who are critically ill, is the organizer of this event.

To Trevor, we all hope as your wish comes true, that it is everything you dreamt it would be.

God bless you.

IN APPRECIATION OF JUDGE AARON COHN

HON. MAC COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my most sincere congratulations to and appreciation for Muscogee County Juvenile Court Judge Aaron Cohn.

Columbus, Georgia, which falls within the boundaries of Muscogee County, shares many of the juvenile crime problems faced by cities around the nation. Drugs, gangs, and violent crime are serious challenges that parents, teachers, and law enforcement officers are forced to address every day. When the efforts of these individuals fall short, however, we rely on the juvenile justice system to assist troubled youth and to protect our communities.

Boot camps are one approach that has proved particularly effective in Muscogee County. While some federal bureaucrats have suggested that boot camps are too severe a punishment, Judge Cohn's use of the program has been a very effective "last resort" for some of the area's most difficult cases. I congratulate Judge Cohn for utilizing successful local approaches to juvenile crime such as the boot camp program.

Boot camps are not, however, Judge Cohn's only approach to the juvenile crime problem. Judge Cohn understands that every child represents a unique set of circumstances and is in need of a personalized approach. I am sure I speak for many Muscogee County residents in expressing my appreciation for Judge Cohn's sensitivity to the needs of both children and the communities in which they live. The "tough love" that he provides the children of Muscogee County is saving taxpayers millions of dollars in future adult correctional costs, providing a safer environment for all children in their schools and neighborhoods, and insuring that even the most difficult children are given a fighting chance to succeed in life. Thank you, Judge Cohn, for your love of children and for your dedication to the communities of Georgia.

A FEW WORDS WITH . . . AARON COHN MUSCOGEE COUNTY JUVENILE COURT JUDGE

Monday's paper carried a story that said more than 16,000 juveniles have been sentenced to boot camps since the program began four years ago. As juvenile judge, what is your assessment of that program?

I think it is a wonderful program for some children. Juvenile justice has to be individualized justice: One kid may react better to probation than to incarceration; another kid may require incarceration. It's not an exact science. You just never know sometimes.

One thing we do know: I don't think you can mix 11-year-olds with 15- and 16-year-olds. If the kid is real young I try to steer away from boot camp.

But with the boot camps, we're dealing with children who would never know what the word "discipline" is. And most of the kids going there, the ones we're sending there, are kids we've adjusted, we've talked to them, we've done everything we could to avoid it.

I think the first year, we may have led the pack (in boot camp sentences) for all I know. But we used it only as a last resort, based on the type of offense the person has committed.

What have the results been, in your experience?

The program does work for lots of people. It's like a baseball game—some you win, some you lose, some get rained out. Not every program works with every child, but they'll get something from this program.

I read the article saying the feds think it's a bad program . . . I don't know about any child who's been mistreated. I do know one thing—you couldn't just get some drill instructor at Parris Island. He's got to have tough love, but not so he just scares kids to death.

It's a good plan, but sometimes you may have the wrong person in there. You can't get away from the human equation.

What kind of youthful offender most benefits from a military program of that kind?

I like a child to be around 15 years old or older. We as a general rule do not send the 11- and 12-year-olds because they haven't even reached the age of criminal responsibility.

The bad part is that in any of our work, we can take a kid from a home that has no discipline, that's so fragmented and dysfunctional the family can't handle him. So even after we send him (to boot camp), what does he come back to? The same home, because we don't have enough foster homes, group homes to take care of him.

If we save one kid, if we turn him around, we save taxpayers about \$250,000. You pay now or you pay later, and if we can get him early enough where he doesn't go into the adult system . . . it's the only place we're

going to save them is in the juvenile justice system.

The thing we have to do is make sure there's no favoritism, because not every child is treated alike. Some have a good support system, some have no support system.

You walk a tightrope. I want what's in best interest of the children, but we have to protect our friends and neighbors in the community.

There's nothing wrong with that program as long as it's handled right.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES SHOULD BE EXEMPT FROM SANCTIONS

HON. GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR.

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation on behalf of more than thirty original cosponsors to exempt federally guaranteed agricultural commodities from the application of sanctions under the Arms Export Control Act. Recent nuclear tests in India and Pakistan forced the Administration to impose sweeping economic sanctions on both countries, with potentially devastating consequences for American agricultural exports to South Asia.

Under the terms of the Arms Export Control Act, the President has very little flexibility in the imposition of sanctions. When a non-nuclear weapon state detonates a nuclear device, the U.S. government is required to terminate sales of defense articles, end foreign military financing, oppose all loans from international financial institutions, and prohibit all commercial loans from U.S. banks, except for the purchase of agricultural commodities. The Act also requires the government to deny any credit guarantees or financial assistance by any department or agency.

This sanction could effectively cut off any federally guaranteed agricultural exports to either India or Pakistan. These new sanctions come at a difficult time for many American farmers, who are experiencing historically low grain prices, and who could now be locked out of a market of 1.1 billion consumers.

Some of these sanctions may have a place, and U.S. interests are certainly served by limiting the flow of technologies and financing that contribute to weapons proliferation. But having failed to deter nuclear testing, what continued purpose do the broader, unilateral sanctions serve? If international competitors quickly fill the market that the U.S. has unilaterally abandoned, the effects of most sanctions will be negligible. In a classic case of unintended consequences, the sanctions on both India and Pakistan may severely impact certain sectors of the American economy while having relatively little consequence on the target nations.

I am particularly concerned about sanctions which deny all U.S. credit guarantees to both nations, a prohibition which could unintentionally punish American agricultural producers. Export credit guarantee programs administered by the Department of Agriculture are a critical tool for foreign agricultural sales, but the Arms Export Control Act could effectively cut off any federally guaranteed exports to either India or Pakistan. Such sanctions come at

a difficult time for many American farmers, who are experiencing historically low grain prices, and who could now be locked out of a market of 1.1 billion consumers.

The issue goes beyond the specific programs guaranteed through the Department of Agriculture by undermining American's reliability as a supplier. Sanctions introduce an uncertain element that makes our trading partners reluctant to do business with us when more consistent, reliable trade partners are available. International competitors have already indicated a willingness to fill orders for American agricultural commodities. Our farmers lose twice in this situation—we miss the first sale and will have difficulty convincing the governments of India and Pakistan to buy from us in the future.

This legislation provides a necessary clarification of applicable sanctions under the Arms Control Export Act. While I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to make this determination, the terms for an exemption remain unclear and require codification. This effort must be part of a larger process of reviewing the effectiveness and hidden costs associated with unilateral sanctions. Legislated, mandatory sanctions force diplomatic flexibility to the side in favor of a chainsaw approach to carving out foreign policy positions. The Arms Export Control Act has forced the President into a corner and marginalized the role of the United States in South Asia. Pulling India and Pakistan away from the precipice of armed confrontation will require an element of delicate maneuvering that should be accommodated in the U.S. Code.

TALENTED HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS REPRESENTING OREGON

HON. ELIZABETH FURSE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, on May 2–May 4, 1998, more than 1,200 students from 50 states and the District of Columbia competed in the national finals of the We the People . . . The Citizens and the Constitution program in Washington, D.C. I am proud to announce that the class from Lincoln High School from Portland representing Oregon and the First Congressional District won an honorable mention as one of the top ten finalists. These young scholars worked diligently to reach the national finals by winning local competitions in their home state.

The distinguished members of the team representing Oregon are:

Alyssa Anne Aaby, Rebecca Mae Allen, Milo Twohy Dochow, Ian James Dunlap, Joshua Josef Hansen, Andrea Marina Hart, Thomas Hugh Hendrickson, Misha Andrew David Isaak, Laura Elizabeth Kanter, Aaron Matthew Lande, Andrew Benjamin Lauck, Dugan Alan Lawrence, Marcus Page Lindbloom, Brenna Rose McMahon, Maren Christine Olson, Galway Peter O'Mahony, Nicholas Albert Peters, Emma Rachel Pollack-Pelzner, Jennifer Lewis Rosenbaum, Jay Boss Rubin, Karen Deborah Rutzick, Margaret Suzanne Schouten, Kennon Harris Scott, Andrew Patterson Sheets, Meghan Marie Simmons, Kristin Kiele Sunamoto, Evan Miles Wiener.

I would also like to recognize their teacher, Mr. Hal Hart, who deserves much of the credit for the success of the team. The district coordinator, Mr. Daniel James, and the state coordinator, Ms. Marilyn Cover, also contributed a significant amount of time and effort to help the team reach the national finals.

The We the People . . . The Citizens and the Constitution program is the most extensive educational program in the country developed specifically to educate young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The three-day national competition simulates a congressional hearing in which students' oral presentations are judged on the basis of their knowledge of constitutional principles and their ability to apply them to historical and contemporary issues.

Administered by the Center for Civic Education, the We the People . . . program, now in its ninth academic year, has reached more than 75,000 teachers, and 24 million students nationwide at the upper elementary, middle and high school levels. Members of Congress and their staff enhance the program by discussing current constitutional issues with students and teachers.

The We the People . . . program provides an excellent opportunity for students to gain an informed perspective on the significance of the U.S. Constitution and its place in our history and our lives. I congratulate these students in the national finals and look forward to their continued success in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO HERBERT AND SALLY BOYKIN

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a couple celebrating their 50th wedding anniversary, Herbert and Sally Boykin of Rembert, South Carolina.

Mr. Boykin worked first as a janitor and then as a custodial supervisor in the Sumter County schools. He also served as a Deacon for more than forty years at Union Baptist Church and recently retired as a Chairman of the Deacon Board. Mr. Boykin is also a Mason.

Mrs. Boykin returned to school after having five children to continue her education at Morris College where she became a certified classroom teacher. She taught in Kershaw County and the City of Sumter for more than thirty years. Mrs. Boykin is still an active member of the Deaconess Board and the National Council of Negro Women.

Mr. & Mrs. Boykin were married on July 11, 1948. After ten years of marriage, the couple had five children. The Boykins worked hard to provide a college education for all five of their children. They remain active members of Union Baptist Church, where their children were baptized.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in honoring Herbert and Sally Boykin, as they celebrate their Golden Anniversary.

RECOGNIZING "MATHCOUNTS"
CONTEST STAR**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Ms. NOTRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sarah Gilberg, one of the many achievers of the D.C. public schools. Sarah Gilberg, an eighth-grader at Alice Deal Junior High School, recently finished first nationwide among all female participants at the national "Mathcounts" competition here in Washington. Her hard work has won her a \$3,000 scholarship from the American Association of University Women. Today I rise to offer Sarah much-deserved recognition from the entire city and from this body.

Sarah Gilberg placed first in the state level of "Mathcounts" before moving on to lead the small D.C. team to a 25th-place finish in the national competition. Her performance, which surpassed that of all other young women in the competition nationwide, shows that achievement is not limited to private schools. An eighth-grade student in Mr. Guy Brandenburg's geometry class, Sarah has taken the initiative and has met with great success. Sarah pursues interests in astronomy, art and music, in addition to her ongoing work in mathematics. Under the able and dedicated coaching and encouragement of a generous leader, Guy Brandenburg, she has risen to excel, and has added this latest award to many others held by Alice Deal Junior High

School. Sarah truly represents the well-rounded D.C. student, combining her intellectual, academic and personal interests to achieve larger and larger honors. Across this city, DCPS students work hard and achieve excellence each and every day. Like Sarah Gilberg, many D.C. students build exemplary records but most go unnoticed.

Members of the House have been quick to criticize the District's public school system for its considerable failures. I know that Members would want to recognize one of the many achievers produced by the D.C. public school system. I urge every Member to take note of the stars of the District of Columbia's public school system, beginning with Sarah Gilberg. I invite members and staff to participate in helping our youngsters to improve by mentoring, tutoring, and finding other ways to help our public schools. Public education needs our personal attention in order to blossom and reach for the stars. I am happy to represent Sarah Gilberg, one of these bright stars.

TRIBUTE TO STERLING HAALAND

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMASOF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on July 2nd, the United States will lose 30 years of defense research experience and program management skills when Mr. Sterling Haaland, the Executive Director of the Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, takes retirement. His

knowledge and experience are going to be sorely missed.

If you consider the measure of our nation's ability to defend us to be an ability to accurately deliver force, Sterling Haaland's work stands out. His expertise and accomplishments have produced more accurate weapons systems, better flight software for pilots and state of the art facilities for weapons development and testing at the Navy's China Lake and Pt. Mugu ranges into the Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division.

More than senior executive, program manager or researcher, Sterling Haaland's work embodies the skill and dedication this country has come to depend on getting from its defense professionals in times of crisis. When called upon to ensure our troops in Desert Storm had the best equipment we could provide, Haaland's organization made critical improvements to the AIM-9M Sidewinder missile, adapted the HARM anti-radar missile to Persian Gulf conditions, adjusted fuzes, missiles and bomb subsystems to meet new conditions and delivered improved electronic warfare systems to Navy and Marine pilots.

The legacy Sterling Haaland leaves behind him is one of accomplishment. A new generation of professionals is assuming the responsibilities he has carried. His example and the premier defense research organization he leaves behind are blueprints his successors will be able to follow in keeping the Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, in the forefront of defense technology development and testing.